THE
NEW YORK REVIEW

VOL. III MAY-JUNE, 1908 NO. 6

THE PETRINE TEXTS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Vincent McNabb, O. P.

It is no part of the present paper to assume or deny the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Although the traditional view is finding its way back to the minds of critics, the purpose of the present exegesis may be served by any standpoint an exegete may take up; and, to be quite fair, it is a moot-point which theory of authorship serves the thesis best. Perhaps on the whole the claims of St. Peter become more unassailable if we see in the Fourth Gospel the very mind and words of St. John. Yet, what we shall write about the matter may go to show that these claims are almost equally strong if we take the Gospel not as a message from the beloved disciple who leaned upon the bosom of Christ, but as the witness of some forgotten Christian who leaned upon the mind of the early Church.

The usual method of dealing with the Gospel witness to St. Peter's supremacy has hitherto been to group the texts under certain headings, e. g., (1) The Promise of Christ to St. Peter; (2) The Fulfilment of the Promise. We need not state our reasons for changing this method, serviceable as it is, for another which borrows additional force from its natural and scientific treatment of the texts. A mere *a priori* way of dealing with biblical texts is sometimes valid and even valuable. Yet at its best, it can never equal in validity or strength the *a posteriori* method which throughout the chronological order of ideas sees the continuity, growth, survival and validity of Christian dogmas and principles.

To take a true estimate of the witness of the Fourth Gospel, then, it must be borne in mind that whoever its writer was, he was a Christian of not later than the first half of the second century. Even

to those who refuse to accept him as an authority for the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ, it is clear that he must be taken as an ear and eye witness of the Church of the opening years of the second century. Nor need he be looked on as a sacred writer inspired by the Holy Ghost, but as a human historian informed and, so to say, inspired by the things he heard and saw around him.

Again, he must confessedly be looked on as a primitive writer to whom the Synoptic Gospels were familiar. He has an instinct, amounting almost to genius, for avoiding whatever has been recorded in these Gospels. Moreover he is, if we may be allowed the phrase, an exegetical peace-maker. He is greatly concerned to harmonise discordant statements in the Synoptics. Lastly, to the office of peace-maker he adds that of "continuator." He makes good whatever has been missed; he fills in what has been overlooked.

No doubt in all this work of harmonising and completing he was aided by the then state of Christianity. It would be useless to deny that the fortunes of the Church varying from year to year brought to mind the significance of many sayings of the Master. After a lapse of fifty years, when the Church had taken possession of almost the "Orbis Terrarum," the rise and solution of ecclesiastical difficulties could not fail to bring out upon the house tops phases uttered by the Master behind closed doors. Remarks drawn from Him by the doings of each day and fitted to meet passing needs were seen in course of time to be valid for other days and wider issues.

Of these matters the question of ecclesiastical government was naturally destined to speedy development. Practical wants outran intellectual difficulties. The question of the hierarchy was more urgent if not more fundamental than the question of the Creed. We are not surprised to read the misunderstanding that arose between St. Peter and St. Paul, or the troubles begotten in the Church of Corinth. If then the Fourth Gospel is the work of St. John or of a disciple of St. John, it is almost unthinkable that it should contain no reference to the ecclesiastical and hierarchical development which was everywhere taking such strides, and often producing a selvage of stress and misunderstanding.

Before the appearance of the Fourth Gospel St. John's witness to the primacy of Peter had found a place in the Apocalypse. To appreciate this witness to the full it must be borne in mind that the writer of the Apocalypse put forward claims to a high position in the hierarchy of the Church. With apostolic boldness he frankly cor-

rected the Bishops of seven sees, founded by St. Paul. Among those whom he reprimanded was St. Timothy. On any theory of the authorship of the Apocalypse it is undeniable that the writer could not expect to further his own claims by supporting those of St. Peter. To exalt St. Peter's claims was in reality to diminish or to seem to diminish his own. Moreover, the theme of the book does not at first sight demand the slightest reference to St. Peter's position. If St. Peter's name and privilege find a place in the book it is because the writer fully recognised that St. Peter's providential position, no matter how frankly stated, could nowise endanger his own.

When, therefore, he described the twelve foundations of the Church, he makes it clear that one of those twelve,—and that one confessedly, St. Peter—had a privilege beyond his fellow apostles. To each of the apostles is assigned a mystical stone;

14. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.

18. And the building of the wall thereof was of Jasper stone....

19. And the foundations of the wall of the city were adorned with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was Jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony, etc.

It has been often remarked that the whole wall of the city was of the same stone, Jasper, as the first foundation.

Without laying undue stress upon this passage from the Apocalypse, we may fairly rank it amongst the witness of St. John. If it does nothing further, at least it serves as a "preparatio animi" to those who are about to study the witness of the Fourth Gospel. The evidence of the Sacred Scriptures being organic, so to say, rather than syllogistic, is therefore convergent. Consequently there lies upon an enquirer the duty of neglecting no thread of proof, however insignificant.

There is something of dramatic directness in the first mention of St. Peter by the Fourth Gospel.

41. He [Andrew] findeth first his brother Simon and saith to him, "We have found the Messias, which is being interpreted the Christ."

42. And he brought him to Jesus. And Jesus looking on him said, "Thou art Simon the son of Jona. Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter." (Jo. i).

The context of this passage cannot be read without bringing a conviction that the Messias had some special privilege for Simon Bar-Jona.

It must also be remembered that St. John's Gospel seems to have been written to counteract false views that had arisen in Asia Minor concerning the Gospel of St. Luke. It would appear that St. Luke's Gospel circulated amidst the Pauline churches to which its Pauline point of view specially appealed. It is not unlikely that sometime before the publication of the Fourth Gospel the Marcan document and the Matthæan Logia had begun to circulate amongst these churches Their circulation would naturally give rise to difficulties; for between the Lucan gospel and the lately arrived documents of Mark and Matthew there were discrepancies of seeming moment. It is almost a matter of common agreement among all schools of modern exegesis that the Fourth Gospel is an attempt to bridge over these discrepancies and to assert the authority of the Marco-Matthæan document.

In this first mention of St. Peter there is a signal instance of St. John's wish to support the Matthæan tradition. It will be remembered that in the account of the scene at Cæsarea Philippi St. Matthew is the only Synoptic writer to mention the text *Tu es Petrus*: (Mt. xvi, 18). Its absence from St. Mark's Gospel, we have already shown to be intelligible. But the fact that St. Luke, the secretary of St. Paul, passed it over in silence would give rise to weighty misgivings in the minds of the Pauline converts in Asia Minor. It was to quell these misgivings that St. John wrote his eye and ear witness to the significant name, *Cephas*, which the Master had bestowed upon his disciple at their first interview. So earnest is his wish to justify the Matthæan tradition that he gives the Aramaic original Cephas and adds its Greek equivalent.

It will be conceded that this argument loses little if any of its force even in the supposition that St. John is not the author of the gospel from which it is taken. It is certainly an astonishing fact that such an argument should be made in Asia-Minor in those early years if St. Peter had not received those privileges commonly attributed to him.

St. John's next mention of St. Peter is almost an expansion of the same argument.

vi. 68. And Jesus said to the twelve, "Will you also go away?"

69. And Simon Peter answered Him, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life? And we have believed and have known that Thou art the Christ the Son of God."

The position of these words at the close of the sixth chapter, lends them additional force. It will easily be conceded that the

events and arguments of this chapter are of central importance in the mind of their writer. If it is also granted that St. John's aim in closing the chapter with the foregoing words is to support the teaching of St. Matthew's Gospel (xvi, 17, 18), the phrases used for that purpose become doubly significant. They are introduced at the close of a long and closely reasoned discussion by the Saviour on the essence of the Incarnation. St. Matthew places them at Cæsarea Philippi where the question of our Blessed Lord grows out of no antecedents or preliminaries. But the events on the banks of Tiberias, the multiplication of the five barley loaves and two fishes, the calming of the storm, the long heated discussion in the synagogue at Capharnaum, the incredulity of the Jews, and last of all, the defection of "many of Christ's disciples" are a striking preparation to the climax of Simon Peter's confession of faith. There is also a touch of special delicacy, not often noticed by commentators, in the fact that St. John breaks his rule of recording the events in Judea, to inform us that St. Peter's confession of faith took place in St. Peter's own dwelling town, Capharnaum.

It will thus be seen that the Fourth Gospel, by whomsoever written, introduces us to a Petrine atmosphere of no uncertain character. If its author re-edits the Matthæan account of St. Peter's act of faith in the Master, and the Master's act of preference for St. Peter, the re-editing serves only to strengthen the claims of St. Peter. The name by which St. Peter has come down to history is seen to have been, not so much the outcome of a casual profession of faith, but part of a divinely-arranged plan. It is not won by the saint's loyalty; but given and imposed by the Master, who had called twelve from the crowds, and one from the twelve. Moreover, the profession of faith, which St. John detached from the change of name, is set in a bed of circumstances, where it shines with redoubled brilliancy.

The fourth mention of St. Peter at the Last Supper may be looked upon as completing St. Luke's witness to the Petrine claims. The Master naturally begins the ceremony of washing the feet of the apostles with St. Peter. There is a reference to Judas, both here and in the sixth chapter, which serves to bring St. Peter's privilege into greater prominence, when St. Peter had made his profession of faith.

vi. 71. Jesus answered, "Have not I chosen you twelve; and one of you is a devil."
72. Now He meant Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, for this same was about to BETRAY Him.

Compare this with the passage from Ch. xiii.:

9. Simon Peter saith to Him, "Lord, not only my feet, but also my hands and my head.

10. Jesus saith to Him, "He that is washed, needeth not but to wash his feet, but is clean wholly. And you are clean, but not all."

11. For He knew who it was that would BETRAY Him. Therefore He said, "You are not all clean."

The contrast in these two passages between Simon, the son of Jona and Judas, the son of Simon, is very striking.

Moreover, in the light of the twenty-first chapter of St. John, the following dialogue is not without its meaning.

36. Simon Peter saith to Him, "Lord, whither goest Thou?" Jesus answered "Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow hereafter."

37. Peter saith to Him, "Why cannot I follow Thee now? I will lay down my life for Thee."

38. Jesus answered him, "Wilt thou lay down thy life for Me? Amen, amen, I say to thee, the cock shall not crow till thou deny Me thrice."

The fifth mention of St. Peter completes the story of the great denial, by giving us the name of the servant, Malchus, whose ear St. Peter cut off (xviii, 10). Later on St. John adds: One of the servants of the high priest (a kinsman of him whose ear Peter cut off) saith to him, 'Did not I see thee in the garden with him?' (xviii, 26).

The sixth mention of St. Peter is a studied contrast between the privileges of St. John and St. Peter.

xx, 2. [Mary Magdalene] ran therefore and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved....

3. Peter therefore went out and that other disciple.

4. And they both ran together and that other disciple did outrun Peter and came first to the sepulchre.

5. And when he stooped down he saw the linen cloths lying; but yet he went not in.

6. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre; and saw the linen cloths lying.

7. And the napkin that had been about the head not lying with the linen cloths, but apart, wrapped up into one place.

8. Then that other disciple also went in.

(a) We must remember the singular privilege granted to St. John on Mt. Calvary and recorded by him (xix, 25-27).

(b) Though Mary Magdalene was an eye and ear witness of the granting of the privilege, St. John does not represent her as giving him the first place amongst the apostles.

(c) St. John supports the Marcan witness (Mk. xvi, 7) that Mary Magdalene brought the tidings of the Resurrection especially to St. Peter.

(d) St. Luke (xxiv, 12), tells us that St. Peter *ran*. St. John completes the scene by saying that St. Peter and himself both ran.

(e) Though the younger disciple was the first to reach the sepulchre, he would not take upon himself to be the first to enter it. His privilege over the Mother of Christ gave him no privilege over the Body of Christ.

(f) The HEAD-cloth is apart; even as Peter, the Head, was apart from the rest of the Apostles. St. John's mystical tendencies lead him to see symbols in every word or deed of his Master. We may remark in passing that after the reference to washing the FEET, (xiii, 10), there is an immediate reference to Judas (xiii, 11). These lesser points might seem trivial to a modern author; but they cannot seem trivial to a modern commentator. They are demanded by the pyschology of the Fourth Gospel; and it is no part of criticism to neglect the symbolism, however crude or naive, of the author commented.

The seventh and last mention of St. Peter is contained in the twenty-first chapter of St. John's Gospel. There are two main incidents. (1) The miraculous draught of fishes, and (2) the dialogue between Christ and St. Peter.

I. The Miraculous Draught of Fishes.

St. John has evidently identified this last draught of fishes with the first. In this way he was carrying out his usual intention of dealing with St. Luke's Gospel (Lk. 5). The two descriptions are so contrasted both where they agree and where they differ that a list of their agreements and differences may help to a thorough understanding of St. John's witness.

Agreements.

1. The chief boat is the Bark of Peter.
2. The fishermen have laboured all night; it is morning. (Lk. v, 5, Jo. xxi, 3, 4).
3. Jesus tells them to try again (Lk. v, 4; Jo. xxi, 6).
4. They catch a vast draught. (Lk. v, 6; Jo. xxi, 6).
5. Peter goes to Jesus. (Lk. v, 8; Jo. xxi, 7).
6. Jesus makes a promise to Peter. (Lk. v, 10; Jo. xxi, 15).

Differences.

1. Lk. v, 4. Launch out into the deep.
   Jo. xxii, 6. Cast the net on the right side.
2. Lk. v, 6. Their net broke.
   Jo. xxi, 11. The net was not broken.
3. Lk. v, 7. Two boats, and one was John's.
   Jo. xxi, 2. There was one boat—Peter's; and John was in it.
5. Lk. v, 3. Jesus was in the boat.
   Jo. xxi, 4. Jesus stood on the shore.
6. Lk. v, 7. Their partners that were in the other boat. . . came and filled both ships.
   Jo. xxi, 11. Simon Peter went up and drew the net to land, full of great fishes.
7. Lk. v, 10. Thou shalt catch men.
   Jo. xxi, 15. Feed my lambs. 16. Feed my lambs.. 17 Feed my sheep.

It is noteworthy that St. John who formerly had his own boat is now to be found in the Bark of Peter!

II. The Dialogue Between Jesus and St. Peter.

In order to beckon attention to some hidden points in the dialogue we shall set down the following scheme:

15. Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these?
    Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.
16. Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?
    Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee.
17. Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?
    Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee.

One of St. Peter's chief faults was to have set himself above his fellow-apostles in personal devotion to his Master. He did not realize that the privileges granted to him, being of an official character, betokened no personal supremacy in the matter of morals. In the event his personal prerogative was a sad display of weakness followed by a three-fold denial. Before his fall he had boasted that if all should be scandalized, he alone would not be scandalized. As an acknowledgment of the Master's preferential action towards him, and in reparation for his own preferential boast, the Risen Saviour asked him for a declaration of preferential love; lovest thou me *more* than *these?* But the triple fall had taught a hard lesson to St. Peter. He was no longer in a boastful frame of mind. The ignominy of the denial

forbade him to compare himself with others or even to use the same word of love [αγαπω]. He merely replies, thou knowest that I love (φιλω) thee.

His Master was too gentle to overlook St. Peter's humble-mindedness. As if to give in to His disciple's new-found fear, in putting the question again. He left out the dreaded comparison, and merely asked, lovest thou me? Even in that form, the question overtaxed the humility of the Saint. Αγαπω, or its Aramaic equivalent, suggested a tenderness and intimacy of love which St. Peter would no longer appropriate. For the second time he used the phrase, yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love (φιλω) thee. There could be but one issue to this duel of humility; and yielding wholly to His disciple's lowly mistrust the Master put the question in his disciple's own words: φιλεις με. No wonder that upon such a bed-rock of self-mistrust the wise master-builder could rear the Church; no wonder that to such a good shepherd the chief-shepherd[1] could give the charge of feeding both the lambs and the sheep who themselves feed the lambs.

There are many reasons for considering this last witness of St. John to be the strongest proof of St. Peter's claims. As the argument is convergent we will set it down under certain headings.

1. It is commonly held that the Fourth Gospel ended with the phrase: "But these [things] are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; and that believing you may have life in his name." (xx, 31).

2. Chapter xx, 1, is thus felt to be an after-word, a post-script; and, if so, it must have been written for some definite purpose. This purpose may be, perhaps, discovered by internal and external evidence.

3. There are two main facts in the post-script: the commission to St. Peter and the promise to St. John, and these two facts grow out of certain external circumstances of the time of writing.

4. Before the death of St. John there had arisen a state of things which must have caused many difficulties in the early Christian Church. All the Apostles were dead. St. James' successor ruled the Church at Jerusalem. St. Peter's successor sat in the chair of the Fisherman. The apostolic dignity was the highest in the church; and one alone, St. John, could claim apostleship. Moreover this Apostle had shown his apostolic power and boldness by reprimanding seven of the Sees established by St. Paul or by the followers of St. Paul.

[1] αρχιποιμενος (1 Pet. v, 4)—the only mention in the New Testament.

Again, this one remaining Apostle had received from his divine Master a mystic promise of life. Indeed it was commonly believed that he was not to die—and the common belief was confirmed by the fact that when condemned to death by Domitian, the Apostle came forth from a cauldron of boiling oil, as the three children came forth from the Babylonian furnace.

5. Whilst thinking over this the early Christians would naturally be forced to ask themselves "What is St. John's position in the Church? Is he its Head? Is an Apostle not of greater power and authority than the successor of an Apostle? And after having received so many favours from the Messias, after having stood by the Cross, after having been given charge of the Mother of Christ, if this Apostle has received a further gift of immortality, must he not have been providentially appointed to rule the whole *Ecclesia*?"

6. About this time the Corinthian Church was distracted as in St. Paul's days by a struggle of parties. It is hardly possible that having received their Christianity from Asia Minor, and from an apostle, they should not turn their eyes towards Ephesus and towards another Apostle, whose watchfulness safeguarded seven of the Pauline Churches.

Moreover Ephesus was the nearest Asiatic port to Corinth. There was in all likelihood a service of packets by which a letter could receive its answer in a few days.

7. Nevertheless the Corinthian Church did not lay its differences officially before St. John. Or rather it was not St. John the Apostle, but St. Clement, the successor of an apostle, who settled the dispute. And this successor of an apostle lived in Rome, which was at a much greater distance from Corinth than was Ephesus!

8. But even if this view of the Corinthian Church is not substantiated by history, it still seems certain that the post-script was added to the original draft of the Fourth Gospel in order to meet the two difficulties felt by the early Church. If the Corinthians did send a messenger to St. John at Ephesus it is not unlikely that he would send back with them his gospel with the addition of the incident calculated to settle their doubts. And just as he seems to have prefixed the "Logos" document for the benefit of the Greek mind he may have added the post-script for the good of the Corinthian mind.

9. At any rate, St. John could not say more clearly that he was not immortal, that he was not going to live for ever. Nor could he have well made a more definite declaration that he was not

the head of the Church. If, in the event, the Church of Corinth in spite of its strong Greek dislike of Roman government, submitted its difficulties to the See of Rome it was in obedience, if not to the letter, at least to the spirit of this closing witness of St. John to the claims of St. Peter.

In looking over the witness of the Fourth Gospel to the claims of St. Peter, no open-minded critic can escape the conviction that its writer is an exponent of the Petrine claims. St. Peter is mentioned a hundred and fifty-five times in the New Testament; and fifty times in the Fourth Gospel. Considering how few topics are handled by St. John and how much of his work is given to lengthy discussions and discourses these fifty mentions are eloquent of the writer's devotion to St. Peter. So that even if the Fourth Gospel were a thesis rather than a history the claims of Peter are an essential part of that thesis.

Nor can any theory of the authorship of the Gospel break or lessen its witness. Were it even assumed for the sake of discussion that the Gospel was the clever forgery of a *Roman* Catholic, eager to exalt the Bishop of Rome, the evidential worth of the Gospel would be little changed. We should then be rid of the problem of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But we should not be rid of the problem of the Fourth Gospel. We should merely have changed one difficulty for another, and perhaps for a heavier, difficulty. For it is notorious that the Fourth Gospel is as Asiatic in temper as it is Petrine. It circulated amongst the Greek speaking cities of Asia-Minor. If its Petrine doctrine was a new thing in those parts, why was there no man amidst the followers of St. Paul to resist it boldly to its face? Why did it meet with such acceptance? If its teaching was welcomed everywhere as Catholic, though Roman, who could have ensured it such a welcome if not an Apostle? The Fourth Gospel must, thus, remain the citadel of the claims of Peter.

We have been assured that

"in meeting Roman theories much might be done by historical research, but the proper field of inquiry for this purpose lies in the first six centuries of the Christian era. For it was then that the foundations of the Papal theory were established, and the ground which the Papacy had won before the time of Gregory the Great was never called in question by any national church before the Reformation."[2]

[2]Church Quarterly Review, April, 1903. pp. 141, 142.

It need hardly be said that one of the most burning points of discussion is greatly the gainer by this admission; for it is no little gain to narrow the field of discussion. But when once biblical facts are resolutely interpreted by modern exegetical methods it may perhaps be found that the field of discussion is narrowed still further; and that the whole problem of St. Peter must be dealt with—and may be solved—in the pages of the Fourth Gospel.

VINCENT MCNABB, O. P.

HEBREW PROPHETISM BEFORE THE EIGHTH CENTURY

Honoré Coppieters, D. D.

One of the most distinctive and interesting elements in the history of Jewish religion is constituted by the phenomenon of prophecy. It is a point which has always attracted the attention of exegetes and theologians, and indeed of every well informed reader of the Bible. Through the comparative history of religions it has been much studied of late, and the most varied opinions have been expressed in regard to it. The question is especially obscure with regard to prophetism before the times of Amos and Osee, the first canonical prophets. What do we know of the history of ancient Hebrew prophetism? What is its nature and real religious significance? A fresh and summary treatment of these questions seems to be justified by the present-day controversies, more especially since the subject has been little treated in Catholic biblical literature.[1]

The books of Samuel and of Kings and the post-exilic historical work, the book of Chronicles give us a number of points of information

[1]Among the works by Catholic scholars dealing with the question of Prophetism among the early Hebrews the following may be mentioned: Mgr. Meignan, *Les Prophètes d'Israel, quatre siècles de lutte contre l'idolatrie.* Paris, Lecoffre. 1892. *Les deux premiers livres des Rois.* ib. Victorion, 1879. The dissertation of Father Laur notwithstanding the limitations implied in its title, viz., *Die Prophetennamen des alten Testamentes* (Freiburg in Switz. 1903), examines in reality all the important questions connected with the subject of Prophetism among the ancient Hebrews, and we have no hesitation in saying that it is the best monograph on the subject from the pen of any Catholic writer.

The Protestant literature bearing on this topic is vastly more abundant, and reference can here be made to only a few of the principal works. Among these are: A. Kuenen, *De Propheten en de Prophetie onder Israel.* 2 vols. Leiden, 1875. E. Koenig, *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testamentes.* 2 vols. Leipzig, 1882. E. Reuss, *Les Prophètes,* 1876. W. Robertson Smith, *The Prophets of Israel,* 1895. More recent works are the following: A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy* (edited by J. A. Paterson), Edinburgh, 1904. L. W. Batten, *The Hebrew Prophets,* New York, 1905. J. C. Matthes, *De Israelitische Propheten,* Amsterdam, 1905. C. H. Cornill, *Der Israelitische Prophetismus.* 6th edition, Strasburg, 1906. J. Réville, *Le Prophétisme hébreu,* Paris, 1907. Early Hebrew Prophetism has been discussed especially by R. Krætschmar, *Prophet und Seher im alten Israel,* Tuebingen, 1901; by Franckh, *Die Prophetie in die Zeit vor Amos,* in the *Beitrage zur Forderung christlicher Theologie,* 1905; by W. R. Harper, in the Introduction to his *Commentary on Amos and Osee,* Edinburgh, 1905, and by E. Koenig, *Der Aeltere Prophetismus,* in the *Biblischen Zeit-und Streitfragen,* 1905.

concerning ancient Hebrew Prophetism. These books include documents of different epochs and of unequal historical value. They must be used with a prudent and judicious criticism. The examination of these documents will reveal to us in ancient Hebrew prophetism an essential distinction which has been too often overlooked or at least imperfectly stated. There was what we shall call a *Lower Prophetism* and a *Higher Prophetism*: Prophets by *voluntary consecration* and Prophets by *personal vocation.*[2]

Lower Prophetism. The Nebe'im or Prophets by Voluntary Consecration.

The office of prophecy is presented to us as an institution already flourishing in the age of Samuel, in the ninth century.

A "man of God," we are told in the first book of Samuel (ii, 27 sq.), foretold to the high priest Heli the rejection and downfall of the priestly family, of which he was head. About the same time, when "the word of God was rare and the vision infrequent," the youthful Samuel was favored by Yahweh with prophetic gifts (iii, 1-14). He too is a "man of God" (ix, 6, 7, 8), a seer רֹאֶה (ix, 11. 19). He carried out the divine intentions, he knows the future, he is consulted by those who wish to find lost objects. And be it noted that all critics acknowledge these latter narratives to belong to the most ancient sources of the first book of Samuel.

Not far from the city of Samuel, which was Rama, companies of Nebi'im, or "bands" of prophets, to translate literally, went about prophesying through the countryside. The first book of Samuel gives us a striking description of them. "And after that thou shalt come to Gabaa of God, where the garrison of the Philistines is: and when

[2]The scholars who admit this distinction are not agreed as to the term whereby each of the two groups should be designated. R. Kraetzchmar (*Prophet und Seher im Alten Israel*, Tuebingen, 1901) makes use of the terms "Nebiismus" and "Sehertum" (Nabi: prophet, Seher: seer), but it should be remarked that at an early date those who are considered by this author as Prophets style themselves *Nabi*. More accurately, it seems to us, A. Van Hoonacker in his recent commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets (Paris, 1908, p. 269), uses the expressions: "Prophètes par état ou consécration volontaire," et "Prophètes de vocation personnelle." I would willingly apply the term "Lower Prophetism" to the former, and that of "Higher Prophetism" to the latter. The appropriateness of these terms to designate these two classes of prophets, at least as we find them in pre-Exilic times, will be shown in the course of the present paper. E. Koenig (*Offenbarungsbegriff*...I, p. 49 seqq.) employs analogous terms, viz., "primæres Prophetenthum" et "secundæres Prophetenthum," and the same terminology occurs in E. Laur's *Die Prophetennamen des Alten Testaments*. Freiburg (Schweiz), 1.03, p. 66.

thou shalt be come there into the city, thou shalt meet there a company of prophets (נב'א'ם) coming down from the high places, with psaltery and timbrel and pipe and harp before them, and they shall be prophesying. And the spirit of Yahweh shall come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be changed into another man." (x, 5, 6). The continuation of the narrative bears out the prophecy of Samuel.

In another passage in the same book (xix, 18-24), these same Nebi'im are once more introduced, and Saul too. David had just taken refuge with Samuel to escape the wrath of Saul. When Saul heard of it he sent emissaries to take David. "And when they saw a company of prophets prophesying, and Samuel presiding over them, the spirit of Yahweh came also upon them, and they likewise began to prophesy. And when this was told Saul, he sent other messengers; but they also prophesied. And again Saul sent messengers the third time; and they prophesied also. And Saul being exceeding angry, went also himself to Rama, and came as far as the great cistern which is in Socho, and he asked, and said: In what place are Samuel and David? And it was told him: Behold they are in Najoth in Rama. And he went to Najoth in Rama, and the spirit of Yahweh came upon him also, and he stripped himself also of his garments and prophesied with the rest before Samuel, and lay down naked all that day and night."

There is no room for mistake in the distinction to be made between the "Seer," the "man of God" and an ordinary member of a company of "Nebi'im." Not only are their functions considerably different; they differ also in the names they bear.[3] This is shown

[3]The only passage in the Bible where Samuel is called *Nabi* is in I Sam. iii, 20: "And all Israel from Dan even to Beer-Sheba knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of Yahweh." But this verse does not convey by any means the early traditional terminology. This latter appears clearly in the narrative contained in I Sam. ix. It should be remarked also that verse 21 is the natural sequence of verse 19, and Nowack, in his commentary admits here an inversion and translates verse 20 after 21. The LXX has after verse 21 a conclusion analogous to verse 20: "And Samuel was established as a prophet from one end of the land to the other...." May it not be that v, 20, was a marginal gloss which was later inserted into the text, and thus placed in the LXX at a different place from that which fell to it in the Hebrew? It is possible. But to the present writer it seems more probable that the entire passage standing by way of conclusion to the prophetic work of Samuel (iii, 19—iv, 1) is the work of the redactor of the Books of Samuel, who wrote at an epoch when the terminology had already changed. It is indeed true that in Genesis (xx, 7) Abraham is called a *Nabi*, and Moses in Deut. xviii, 15, but these honorific titles reflect the use of the word in later times. Moreover, they are employed but

by an ancient gloss (found in I Sam. ix, 9, but which belongs after v, ii), where Samuel is called a "seer."[4] The gloss states that "in times past in Israel when a man went to consult God, he spoke thus: Come, let us go to the seer. For he that is now called a prophet, in time past was called a seer."

Moreover, the distinction between the *Seer* or prophet of a higher order, and the *Nabi*, or prophet of a lower order, rests on other biblical documents of a pre-exilic date, which we shall examine in due time. The distinction is one which cannot be neglected or misunderstood without leading to an over-estimation of the office of the Nebi'im or an under-estimation of that of the "men of God."

From the fact that these Nebi'im are first mentioned in the time of Samuel and are rather closely connected with him, many authors have concluded that he was their founder.[5] We believe this to be

---

rarely and have no justification in the context, for the characteristics of the *Nabi* or Prophet in the period of the Kings do not belong to either Abraham or Moses as these personages are described in the Bible. Later on we find that in Ecclesiasticus Joshua also is associated with Moses as a prophet, xlvi, 1.

[4]I Sam. ix, 9, interrupts the narrative and furnishes an explanation of verse 11, whence we conclude that its proper place is after verse 11. These two reasons are sufficient to show that verse 9 was a later insertion. On this point the commentators are pretty well agreed, but there is more divergence of opinion when it is question of determining the sense of the gloss. E. Koenig (*Offenbarungsbegriff*...I, p. 59-60) prefers the rendering of the LXX, viz., "the people formerly called the prophet a 'Seer'." According to this the glossator meant to signify that the *people* gave the name of *Seer* to Samuel, who was a *Nabi*, and thus explain why Saul and his comrade made use of that term. To the present writer this explanation of the learned exegete does not seem to be the true one. Taken in its obvious sense I Sam. ix, 9b, does not indicate an opposition between the popular terminology and the ancient one as more correct. This notion could hardly have been in the mind of the glossator, else he would have expressed it more clearly, and besides, he would not have omitted the correction of verse 19, where Samuel himself calls himself a Seer. If the reading of the LXX is to be preferred, it should not be made to express an opposition to that of the Hebrew text. Franckh (*Die Prophetie in der Zeitvor Amos. Beitræge zur Forderung christlichen Theologie.* 1905, p. 31-32) is entirely mistaken with regard to the sense of I Sam. ix, 9, when he says: "The remark indicates clearly that the term *Nabi* replaced the older term *Roch*.... It follows that down to the time of Samuel, the word *Nabi* was not used, even if we suppose that it was known. If this be the case, we cannot escape the conclusion that the change in the terminology was brought about only by the introduction of a new institution or form of prophecy." Whence he concludes that before Samuel there was no *Nabi*! It was not, however, so hard to see that I Sam. ix, 9, has reference only to the use of the word *Roch*; the verse says nothing as to the term *Nabi*, and the following chapter shows clearly that there were then associated with the Seer Samuel, and far inferior to him, a great number of *Nebiim*. We shall see also by reason of what circumstances the change of terminology took place.

[5]Frankh, *Die Prophetie in der Zeit vor Amos*, p. 32-53, 85. J. Réville, *l. c.*, p.13;

incorrect. They existed before the period of Samuel. This opinion is not based exclusively, nor even primarily, on the Elohistic passage in Numbers xi, 25-30. For the narrative itself gives proof that the seventy elders were not "prophets" in any lasting or regular way. It may be added that not all authors admit the historical value of the narrative. But what seems to be a decisive argument in favor of our view can be drawn from the narrative in I Sam. ix, in which the Nebi'im are first introduced to our attention. Here they are spoken of as an institution which no longer excites the wonder of the people, no more than the meeting with some Israelites, who are on their way to the sanctuary to offer their kids, loaves, and wine (x, 4). The relations between Samuel and the Nebi'im were not perhaps as intimate as has generally been supposed. For it is well to note that they are not attested by any other texts than the narrative in I Sam. xix, 19-24, which is generally conceded to be of relatively recent origin.[6] We are of the opinion that this sort of prophetism existed in Israel before the times of Samuel. In view of the silence of the oldest texts, it will be more profitable not to delay over conjectures about the origins of the Lower Prophetism in Israel.

The documents on the history of David and Solomon do not speak of the companies of Nebi'im. However, they had not disappeared. For we learn that in the ninth century, when the impious Jezabel caused the slaughter of the prophets of Yahweh, Abdias concealed fifty of them in each of two caves (I Kings xviii, 3-5). There must therefore have been a good number of them in the Northern Kingdom. In spite of the recent massacre, Achab was able to consult four hundred of them on the war which he was undertaking with Josaphat against the Syrians. At this epoch, we may here remark, the Nebi'im were already consulted about the future. And this we take to be a pretty clear indication that they had gained in importance. For their brethren of the days of Samuel did not seem to busy

Mgr. Meignan, *l. c.*, p. 13, 14; F. Vigouroux (*La Sainte Bible polyglotte*, ii, p. 391) also affirms that Samuel was the founder of the schools of the prophets, but critics are more and more ranging themselves on the opposite side. See v. g., Cornill, *l. c.*, p. 27-28.

[6] This narrative as well as the story in I Sam. x, 10-13, has for its object to give an explanation of an old saying, viz: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" It is in a way a replica of the first, but it is to be remarked that the situation is far more strange and marvelous. Saul begins to prophesy before he has seen the *Nebiim* on the route to Ramah! See in this connection the commentaries of Budde, Smith, Nowack, etc., who are agreed that the story in I Sam. xix, 18-24, is very recent and of no historical value.

themselves about predicting the future, nor were they consulted about it. They seem now to have gotten nearer to the type of the Seer. If this view be correct, we can more easily understand the change in the meaning of the word Nabi'. The interpolation I Sam. ix, 9, informs us that the Israelites of olden day applied the term Seer ראה to those who in the writer's own time were called Nabi.' This change is more easy to account for if in the course of history the Nebi'im had raised themselves in respect and importance.[7]

The view we have advanced is also in perfect accord with the story of the taking up of Elias (III Kings ii, 1-18); and with that of the miracle of Eliseus (*ibid.* iv, 38-41). In the first narrative we learn that the "sons of the prophets" whom Elias and Eliseus, on their way from Gilgal (the Gilgal south-west of Silo) to Jericho, met at Bethel and at Jericho, knew the future (3, 5). But here also, as in the passages examined above, a difference can be noted between the sons of the prophets and Elias and Eliseus. "Seeing this (the separation of the waters of Jordan) the sons of the prophets who were at Jericho, over against him, said: The spirit of Elias hath rested on Eliseus. And coming to meet him, they worshipped him, falling to the ground." The *man of God* was far superior in dignity to the Nabi,' or member of the company of prophets. Eliseus even seems to have been at the head of a company of prophets (II Kings iv, 38; vi, 7); and the relations of the latter with Elias seem to have been very intimate (II Kings ii, 3, 5, 15).

From the eighth century on we find but little said about the Nebi'im. Amos, when attacked by the priest of Bethel for prophesying evils to the Northern Kingdom, says that he is not a Nabi' nor a son of a prophet; that on the contrary Yahweh has called him and given him the mission to prophesy, without any previous training (ch. vii). It can be inferred from this dialogue between a schismatic priest and a prophet in the eighth century that certain prophets by personal vocation came forth from the societies of Nebi'im. And this too helps to explain the change of title noted in I Sam. x, 9.

The fall of Samaria and the suppression of the Northern Kingdom, in 722, the exile of a large part of its inhabitants, and the Assyrian

[7]Also I Kings xiii, and xx, 35-40, can be quoted in favor of that opinion. It is hard to determine the epoch of the change in the signification of the word *Nabi*. According to the Hebrew and English Lexicon of Brown, Driver and Briggs, "the change probably occurred in the times of Elijah," and we are of the opinion that this judgment is not far from the truth.

colonization naturally tended to smother the religious enthusiasm which characterized the Nebi'im of old. Even in the Southern Kingdom during the century and a half that it survived the fall of the Kingdom of Israel, the Nebi'im seem to have dwindled in numbers and influence. At least the texts make mention of them no more. Perhaps the reform of Josias and the centralization so energetically carried out by that pious monarch had an influence on the decline of the Nebi'im. However this may be, the literature of the Restoration period no longer presents the picture of the Nabi' enthusiast whose songs and music and ecstatic poses are described in the ancient sources of the books of Samuel and Kings.

Having now seen the history of the Nebi'im, we must proceed to study them at closer range in order to estimate the institution from the point of view of its religious significance.

* * *

Through lack of a clear distinction between the prophets by profession and the prophets by vocation, Mgr. Meignan has given a description of the ancient Nebi'im which is altogether fanciful.[8]

"In the quiet retreats which the Bible calls Nayoth[9] (the dwellings)...took refuge the young Israelites whom God called to a life of piety and study: they lived under the care of a master who taught them the Law. They were trained to sing to the accompaniment of the Kinnor. Despite the fact of their life in common, most of them were married men; but they left their families, lived in very narrow cells, and ate together their frugal meals. At stated times all met together in spacious halls. There they performed their exercises of piety and listened to the words of the master, the father....They worked also in the fields, and built their own dwelling-places. But the basis of their life was prayer and study. They devoted themselves to the task of penetrating the secret of the destinies of Israel, of knowing the present and the future. They kept alive the recollection of the olden prophecies and promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But this life of discipline and rule did not rob them of all liberty and initiative. They were allowed to give vent to special inspirations of zeal and of the love of God, especially in their songs and addresses."

---

[8] *Les Prophètes d'Israel*, p. 15, 16.

[9] The meaning of this word is not known.

Evidently Cardinal Meignan is enhancing the ancient Nebi'im and lifting them to the level of the ideal of the prophet such as we know him in the Prophetic Books; while other writers, on the contrary, tend to degrade the ancient "Seer" to the level of the Nabi'.

The accounts in I Sam. x, 5, 6, and xix, 18-24, which we translated above, leave no doubt about the ecstatic transports of the ancient Nebi'im. The description of the prophets of Baal, given in I Kings xviii, 25-29, possesses features which are applicable to the ancient Nebi'im. "Then Elias said to the prophets of Baal: Choose you one bullock and dress it first, for you are many: and call on the names of your gods, but put no fire under. And they took the bullock which he gave them, and dressed it: and they called on the name of Baal from morning even till noon, saying: O Baal, hear us. But there was no voice, nor any that answered: and they leaped over the altar that they had made. And when it was now noon, Elias jested at them, saying: try with a louder voice, for he is a god, and perhaps he is talking, or is in an inn, or on a journey, or perhaps he is asleep, and must be awaked. So they cried with a loud voice, and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till they were all covered with blood."[10]

The Israelitish Nebi'im also inflicted wounds on their faces. The interesting account in I Kings xx, 35-41, proves this. A member of the order of Nebi'im, or sons of the prophets, wishes to reprove King Achab because he had spared Benhadad, and had made an alliance with him. He arranges matters so that he can have Achab pronounce a sentence which he can turn against that monarch himself. To this end, he has himself wounded, so as to look like a soldier returning from battle. Meeting the King, he covers his eyes with an *'apper*, so as not to be recognized.[11] He tells the King that he has permitted the escape of one who was entrusted to his keeping under penalty of death or a fine of a talent of silver. The King pronounces his sentence. Immediately the prophet removes the *'apper*, and applies to the King for his dealings with Benhadad, the sentence just pronounced

[10]Concerning the priests of Baal and others who in antiquity or in more recent times practiced such rites, we refer the reader to the interesting article by Father Vigouroux: *Les Prêtres de Baal* (III Reg. xviii, 23-28) *et leurs successeurs dans l'antiquité et dans le temps présent. Revue Biblique*, 1896, p. 227-240.

[11]The precise meaning of the word אפר is not known. Basing their opinion on the context of this narrative, the lexicographers are unanimous in giving to it the signification of a bandage covering the head and eyes. All writers, however, do not admit the incisions among the *Nebiim*. Cf. Laur, *l. c.*, p. 54-59.

against himself. Without the *'apper*, the King recognizes him at once as a prophet. Some mark about the head was therefore a mark of the prophet. We are of opinion that this mark was precisely scars resulting from self-inflicted wounds. The prophet Zacharias, announcing the suppression of prophethood, writes that they will be ashamed to wear the robe of sackcloth, and that the prophets will try to explain that the scars they bear are not characteristic marks of their profession, but the result of wounds received (xiii, 4-6).

The phenomenon of ecstacy amongst the ancient Nebi'im is also attested by the *derivative* meaning of the verb נבא. The etymology and primitive sense of נבי'א has been long a subject of discussion. It would be useless to repeat here these discussions, since it is now pretty generally agreed to admit a radical נבא with the meaning: to speak, announce, communicate.[12] The Babylonian name of divinity Nabu is derived from this root which also remains in Arabic: naba'a. It goes without saying that the etymological and primitive sense of the word does not throw much light on the nature of the profession of the Nabi' at the time of Samuel. This much is evident from the accounts we have analyzed, that they sang and gave praise to Yahweh to the sound of musical instruments and with an enthusiasm that sometimes was infectious. The praises of Yahweh filled a larger place in the functions of the ancient Nebi'im than the secrets of the future. Might it not be that the word נבי'א was used by the Hebrews in the sense of to speak, to confess, to praise? At any rate, by reason of the phenomena of ecstacy which were of more or less frequent occurrence, the verb in the hitpael form התנבא is used in the sense of to be in a frenzy. Thus Saul, seized by the evil spirit, "prophesied," and sought to slay David (I Sam. xviii, 10). In the Book of Jeremias (xxix, 26), the act of prophesying is expressed by the terms משגע and מתנבא, the former of which means to be beside oneself, to be frenzied. The readiness with which this expression is applied to the prophets is a proof that states of ecstacy sometimes accompanied the gift of prophecy.

The Nebi'im were poor. This fact is made evident by the story in which Giezi, the servant of Eliseus, cuts such an ignoble figure Eliseus had refused the presents offered him by Naaman, the Syrian,

[12]On the etymological signification of the word נביא see F. Koenig, *Offenbarungsbegriff*..., I, p. 71-78. M. Van Hoonacker (*Les Douze petits Prophètes*, p. 269) writes: "According to the probable etymological signification of the word ..the Hebrew נביא is properly the one who speaks in the name of, or in honor of Yahweh, one who sings His praises, preaches His doctrine, proclaims His decrees." See also Laur, *l. c.*, p. 14-38.

after his cure. Giezi ran after the Syrian, and when he had caught up with him, had recourse to the following lie to obtain presents: "My master hath sent me to thee, saying: Just now there are come to me from Mount Ephraim two young men of the sons of the prophets: give them a talent of silver and two changes of garments." He received two talents of silver and two changes of garments (II Kings v, 20-27). Evidently the "sons of the prophets" were understood to be far from well to do. Another story of the same epoch (II Kings vi, 1-7), gives us a fresh proof: a son of the prophets, wishing to cut wood, had to borrow an axe for the purpose. In another case a widow of one of the sons of the prophets owned after her husband's death, nothing but a small quantity of oil (II Kings iv, 1-7). The prophets of Baal also "ate of the table of Jezabel," (I Kings x,viii 19).

In the foregoing pages we have carefully avoided the expression "School of Prophets."[13] This expression, which is in such common use in modern commentaries, is not found in the Bible, and is open to objection. It is true that at the time of Eliseus the Nebi'im lived in communities (II Kings ii, 3, 5, 15; iv, 38; vi, 1,) sometimes under the direction of a higher prophet, a "man of God" (II Kings iv, 33; vi, 1). Unfortunately the Bible tells us very little about these prophet communities, and we cannot share in the assurance with which Cardinal Meignan describes in detail the manner of life led in these schools of prophets.

It is no wonder, after what we have seen, that abuses crept into the institution of prophethood. These self-chosen prophets have sometimes aimed at the office and dignity of the true messenger of God. We see this particularly in the time of Achab. The four hundred prophets consulted by that King were unanimous in predicting victory. One of them, Sedecias, son of Chanaana, the only Nabi' whose name has come down to us, wishing to add strength to his prophecy, made horns of iron, and said: "Thus saith Jehovah, with these horns shalt thou push Syria, till thou destroy it" (I Kings xxii, 11). The book of Kings does not state the motive which induced these four hundred prophets to utter their prediction so lightly. But in many other places the Bible indicates the desire of rewards as the sole determining factor in the prophecies of the Nebi'im. It is suf-

[13]The expressions "prophetical guild," "Prophetenverein," "Propheten-Genossenschaft," "Association or Corporation of prophets" seem much preferable. It is precisely this quality of being a member of an association of prophets that is expressed by the well known Hebraism, "the sons of the prophets."

ficient to read Mich. iii, 5, 11; Osee iv, 5, and other similar passages to see that ambition and material interests often dictated their answers. No doubt these criticisms should not be applied indiscriminately to all the members of the prophetic body, but they show the two main defects of Lower Prophetism among the Hebrews.

Other accusations are sometimes made against them. Some authors go so far as to contest the Israelitish origin of the Nebi'im, and claim that they never aided the interests of Yahwehism, at least in the age of Samuel.[14]

This leads us to a final question: Was the order of the Nebi'im of Israelitish origin, and was it in harmony with or in opposition to Yahwehism?

The latter part of the question is easy of response. In the ninth century the Nebi'im constituted an important factor in the progress of Yahwehism. This indeed is generally admitted. In proof of it may be adduced both the friendly relations in which they were held by Elias and Eliseus, the great champions of Yahwehism in the Northern Kingdom, and also the implacable hatred with which they were persecuted by the wicked Jezabel. Nor is there room for doubt that in the time of Samuel they were already promoting in their own way the worship of Yahweh; it was near the sanctuary, near the hill of God that the youthful Saul met them prophesying.

Some critics of great authority have contended that the institution of the Nebi'im had its origin in the religion of the Chanaanites. We readily acknowledge that the Chanaanites had prophets whose practices were entirely similar to those of the enthusiastic Nebi'im of Samuel's day. As early as the eleventh century, in the judgment of competent Egyptologists, the Golenischeff papyrus describes for us the intervention of a prophet in the Canaanitish town of Byblos.[15]

[14]E. Koenig (*Der Aeltere Prophetismus*, p. 7) quotes among the defenders of this opinion A. Kuenen (*De Propheten*...II, 227 seqq.), J. Wellhausen (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament of Bleek*, p. 212). W. H. Harper is of the same opinion (*Amos and Osee*, p. lv), and Kraetschmar has made himself an ardent champion of the same (*Prophet und Seher*...p. 10-12). We cannot stop to consider all the arguments brought forward in favor of the thesis, but it is worth while to notice the argument which Kraetschmar finds in I Sam. x, 12. When Saul begins to prophesy, answer is made to those who are astonished thereat: "And who is their father?" This answer does not signify that the institution of the *Nebiim* is little esteemed because of Gentile or Chanaanitish origin, but rather that the prophetical spirit may take possession of persons who have never have been admitted to the prophetical associations.

[15]A. Ermann. *Eine Reise nach Phœnizien im XI Jahrhundert vor Christus*, in the *Zeitschrift fuer Egyptische Sprache*...xxxviii (1900) p. 1-14.

The worship of Baal and Astarte had its prophets, as is shown by the well known incident in I Kings xviii; II Kings iii, 13. This similarity, however, is not a proof of the Chanaanitish origin of the Lower Prophetism among the Hebrews. The radical antipathy towards the Chanaanites, which is manifested in the most ancient Jewish documents, especially in regard to matters of religion, would in itself afford a solid argument against any such affiliation. And why should not the Nabi' have been of Israelitish origin? Under the inspiration of strong religious feeling certain Israelites would naturally be moved to consecrate themselves especially to Yahweh, to sing his praises, promote his worship, and contend against the influence of neighboring religions. This same religious feeling would give rise in many instances to those phenomena of extasy which seem strange to us now, but which were not rare in oriental religions; it is not necessary to view them as being of supernatural origin.

Despite the abuses which may have crept into Lower Prophetism in the course of time, the signal services rendered to Yahwehism by the Nebi'im in troublous times should not be forgotten. On the other hand it would be a mistake to view the excitable Nebi'im of the age of Samuel and Saul as the predecessors of the great canonical prophets who were the mouthpieces of Yahweh and the instruments of revelation. Between the glory which shall ever surround such men as Osee, Isaias and Jeremias and the half-contemptuous pity which is felt for the whirling dervish, there is room for the well merited esteem which religious men will not fail to pay to those who served the true God and spread His worship, even though they made use of methods of which a later age does not approve.

II.

Higher Prophetism: Prophets by Special Calling.

The ancient source of the first book of Samuel, which has furnished us with such interesting details concerning the Nebi'im (ix-x, 14), also makes us acquainted with a personality of still higher importance —Samuel "the Seer."[16] This name "Seer" is of ancient usage. It is never found applied, however, to the members of the

[16]Samuel is called a Seer (ראה) in I Sam. ix, 11; ix, 19; I paral. ix, 22; xxvi, 28; xxix, 29. He is called man of God (איש אלהים) in the passage I Sam. ix, 6-10. He is called *Nabi* only once (I Sam. iii, 20), and we have already remarked that this late passage does not represent the ancient terminology. A remarkable example of the latter is contained in I Kings xiii.

prophet societies. It is given to Hanani, a prophet of the times of Asa, who was king of Juda at the end of the tenth and during the first quarter of the ninth century. Similarly we find that the use of the analogous term חוֹזֶה, which has the same meaning as רֹאֶה, is restricted to individuals who have played a noteworthy part in Jewish history: Gad (I Chron. xxi, 9; II Sam. xxiv, 11), Iddo (II Chron. ix, 29; xii, 15), Jehu (II Chron. xix, 2), Asaph (II Chron. xix, 30), Amos (Amos vii, 12).

A third name which presents the same features is that of "Man of God" אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים. We find it in the Bible applied to Samuel (I Sam. ix, 6-10), Semeias (I Kings xii, 22; II Chron. xi, 2), Elias (I Kings xvii, 18, 24; II Kings i, 9-13), Eliseus (a score of times in II Kings iv-vii), Hanan (Jer. xxxv, 4), and several anonymous prophets.

These three terms are of ancient usage. In the final years of the Kingdom of Juda they had gone out of use as names to designate a special prophet, being displaced by the term "Nabi." But while in use, as we have seen, they were never employed with reference to the members of prophet bands. From this we may conclude that men like Samuel, Nathan, Gad, Iddo, Semeias, Elias, Eliseus, and later the ancient canonical prophets, to speak only of the "Men of God," whose names are known to us, are not to be put in the same class with the Nebi'im of the days of Samuel and Saul. And it would be to misinterpret the teaching of the texts to describe the prophetism of the days of Samuel and Saul as "undisciplined and ecstatic."[17] Baentsch, who thus characterizes the ancient prophetism, can justify his view only by rejecting as of no historical value the accounts cited above which speak of "Men of God," including the very ancient passage I Sam. ix-x, 15. He will find few to follow him in this.

It would be impossible within the limits of this article to undertake a presentation of these great figures, or the part they played in

[17]B. Baentsch in an article entitled "Pathologische Zuege in Israels prophetenthum" (*Zeitschrift fuer wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1907, p. 52-81) characterizes the first period of Hebrew Prophetism in the following terms:...die Periode des noch undisciplinirten wilden ekstatischen Prophetenthums in den Zeiten Samuels und Sauls. It may be interesting to know in what manner he conceives of the Prophetism of later centuries. In the time of Elias and of Eliseus it is political Prophetism: die Periode des politischen Prophetenthums in den Zeiten des Elias und Elisa. Finally starting with the eighth century Prophetism becomes moral and religious:...die Periode des religioesethischen Prophetenthums, namentlich seit der Mitte des achten vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts. In three words therefore are summed up the characteristics of Hebrew Prophetism: it was at first "ecstatic," then "political," and finally "moral and religious."

history. We shall merely enumerate in a note, according to chronological order, the "Men of God," of whom record has come down to us.[18] An examination of this list will be enough to prove that before the first canonical prophets Israel possessed remarkable men who exercised upon their contemporaries and upon the religious development of their people an influence which it would be hard to exaggerate. However, the office and functions of these "Seers" or "Men of God" have been very diversely estimated by critics.

* * *

The judgment which one reaches regarding the early representatives of the Higher Prophetism in Israel depends in large measure on the views one holds concerning the stage of development of institutions and beliefs during their times. We think it proper to declare (though it is out of the question to go into the proofs for our assertion here) that we hold to monotheism among the Israelites far before the eighth century, dating in fact from the period of the founders of the

[18]We are not interested in maintaining the trustworthiness of all the details concerning the Prophets which have been consigned in the historical books of the Old Testament, nor is it necessary. The following is a list of the earlier Prophets together with an indication of the passages referring to them.

A prophet anterior to Samuel: I Sam. ii, 27-34.

Samuel: I Sam. especially chapters iii-xii.

Nathan: II Sam. vii, 1-17; I Par. xvii[1-15; II Sam. xii, 1-15; I Kings i, 11-40.

Gad: I Sam. xxii, 5; II Sam. xxiv, 11-25; I Par. xxi, 9-30.

Ahias of Silo: I Kings xi, 29-39; xiv, 18.

Semeias: I Kings xii, 22-24; II Par. xi, 2-4; xii, 5-6.

Addo: II Par. ix, 19; xii, 15, 22.

An anonymous prophet: I Kings xiii.

Azarias son of Oded: II Par. xv, 1-8.

Hanani: II Par. xvi, 7-10.

Jehu son of Hanan: I Kings xvi, 1-7.

Jahaziel: II Par. xx, 14-17.

Eliezer, son of Dodan: II Par. xx, 37.

Elias: I Kings xvii-II Kings ii,.

Eliseus: I Kings xix,; II Kings xiii 19.

Anonymous Prophets: xix, 13-14, 22, 28, 35-40.

Micheas, son of Jemla: I Kings xxii; II Par. xviii.

An anonymous prophet: II Par. xxv, 6-9.

Jonas, son of Amathi: II Kings xiv, 25.

We are thus brought down to Amos and Osee, the earliest of the canonical prophets who lived about the middle of the eighth century, and who put some of their prophecies down in writing. But the history of these prophets and their successors is beyond the scope of the present article. We have omitted from the above list the name of King David because he does not appear in the role of a prophet in the earlier writings.

nation. We might add, without fear of contradiction, that the view which presents the prophets of the eighth century as the beginners of the monotheistic movement is daily losing defenders.

The most ancient accounts of these prophets by special calling give us considerable information as to the way in which they conceived and carried out their mission. Still further light on the same point can be obtained by examining the names applied to the prophet.[19]

The ancient prophet as we have seen, was called "Seer" or "Man of God." Later on this was changed to Nabi', a name originally applied to men of somewhat different rank and office.[20] But the usual title in the olden times seems to have been רֹאֶה: Seer (I Sam. ix, 9). Now we must not conclude from this name that the ancient prophet was merely a foreteller of future events.[21] With reference to this term *Seer*, Laur[22] quotes a remark of Knobel which is pertinent to the matter: "In the term רֹאֶה there is no more the idea of *to see the future* than *to see visions*. The former interpretation is philologically impossible, since *to see* is not the same as *to see the future*; the latter is out of agreement with history, since the most ancient prophets, to whom the name is most frequently (if not indeed exclusively) applied, are least noted for visions." Moreover, so far at least as Samuel is concerned, nobody will believe that his prophetic mission consisted in finding lost objects. He was a "man of God;" he knew the divine wishes and proclaimed them to men; if Yahweh gave him foreknowledge of the downfall of the priestly family of Heli, He revealed to him likewise the sins which were its cause. It is moreover this moral and religious preaching which was the main work of the great figures who rank with Samuel: Nathan, whose parable after David's sin is so justly celebrated; Elias, who protested so strongly against the injustice of Achab towards Naboth. The earlier canonical prophets also are pre-eminently the champions of morality and of Yahwehism,

---

[19]We have already noted that E. Laur has devoted an entire dissertation to this aspect of the problem. The reader may consult it for further details and a more complete study of the question.

[20]We omit discussing here other appellations rarely given to the prophets, the antiquity of which it would be difficult to maintain. Such are "angel of Yahweh," "servant of Yahweh," "watcher," "guardian," "pastor," "man of the spirit," etc. Jer. vi. 27.

[21]Kraetschmar (*l. c.*, p. 19) insists too much, it seems to us, on this aspect of the question. It is not by a long exposition of the incident narrated in I Sam. ix, viz., where Saul comes to the Seer Samuel seeking his father's asses, that the true nature of early Hebrew Prophetism can be adequately made known.

[22]*L. c.*, p. 68.

and their invectives against idolatry, injustice, and impurity cannot be surpassed in vigor.

Becanus has pointed out that their mission consisted primarily in teaching, instructing and reforming the people in the worship of the true God: "primarium eorum officium fuisse docere, instruere, reformare populum in cultu veri Dei." They are men of God in the sense that they know the will of Yahweh. And hence we who admit a revelation in the Old Testament look upon them as instruments of divine revelation.

The ancient prophets did not commit their message to writing, They were above all men of action. The early narratives do not bear even a trace of literary work due to the ancient prophets. But on the other hand the book of Chronicles in several places attributes historical works to them. To Samuel, Nathan, and Gad is attributed the history of David (I Par. xxix, 29), to Nathan, Ahias the Silonite, and Addo that of Solomon (II Par. iv, 29), to Semeias and Addo that of Roboam (II Par. xii, 15), to Addo the life of Abias (II Par. xiii, 22), to Jehu the son of Hanan the story of Josaphat (II Par. xx, 34), to Elias a letter to Joram (II Par. xxi, 12), and Isaias is given as the historian of Osias (II Par. xxvi, 22) and of Ezechias (II Par. xxxii, 32). In view of the silence of the books of Kings, the majority of critics are led to deny the historical value of these data. However this may be, it will not be disputed that to judge the work of the ancient prophets it is not necessary to view them as the official historians of their age.

The Bible accounts show us these ancient prophets as being sometimes endowed by Yahweh with knowledge of the future. But even in these instances there is a marked difference between the prophets and common soothsayers. The secrets revealed to them by Yahweh have always a religious value. To give but one example, Samuel is given knowledge of details insignificant in themselves, but this is to convince Saul of the mission to which Yahweh was calling him.

It is true that we find in the methods of their ministry characteristics which seem to us to-day to be almost incompatible with the mission ascribed to them. This is because we do not sufficiently distinguish between the mission itself and certain mannerisms which belonged to the distant age in which they lived. The reproach applies particularly to the prophets who were in closest contact with the Nebi'im, Elias and Eliseus. We read of Elias that on one occasion

[23]Quoted by Cornely, *Introductio Specialis in Libros V. T.*, II, p. 271.

he girded up his loins and ran before the chariot of Achab from Carmel to Jezrahel (I Kings xviii, 46). Eliseus, prophesying before Joram, King of Israel, called for a harper. And while the harper played, the hand of Yahweh was over Eliseus. And so he prophesied the victory of the Israelites over Moab. These rather strange methods have been called pathological traits[24] in Hebrew prophetism. It would be fairer to see in them reflections of the methods and practices of the Nebi'im, practices in harmony with the views and tastes of the age.

A much more unfavorable criticism, since it affects their whole ministry, has been leveled at these ancient prophets. Winckler[25] and others after him have called the prophets political agents, even professional agitators. This judgment on Hebrew prophetism is altogether unjust. This much is true, that the prophets, even the greatest among the canonical prophets, took a stand on the questions of foreign alliances which came up in their times. The preaching of Isaias against the Assyrian alliance and of Jeremias against Egyptian assistance are famous. But it does not follow that Isaias and Jeremias were political agitators. These prophets looked at the questions of foreign alliances *from the religious point of view*; they saw in them a lack of confidence in Yahweh, often indeed a danger of idolatry, and it is this which accounts for the vigor of their opposition and the severity of their denunciations. Some writers, moreover, exaggerate the extent of the interference of the prophets in the government of the country. From the fact that Ahias the Silonite predicted the coming of Jeroboam to the throne of Israel we have no right to conclude[26] that the prophets shared in the revolt against the first king of Israel. And at any rate it would be easy to show that the prophets took their stand on religious grounds.

Until recently it was the general belief that Hebrew Prophetism—of the higher type, we mean—was a phenomenon unique in history. But in this matter as in so many others the *Babel und Bibel* controversies have brought new opinions to the fore. An attempt is made to find in Babylonia prophets who would be the forerunners of the prophets of Israel.

The phrase "Babylonian prophets" seems now to obtain quite generally amongst writers on Assyriology. But it designates persons

[24]Baentsch, article quoted, p. 65.

[25]H. Winckler, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 1903. B. Baentsch, (*l. c.* p. 64) so characterizes Elias and Eliseus.

[26]Mgr. Meignan, *Les Prophètes d'Israel*, p. 49 seqq.; Harper, *Amos and Osee*, p. xxxii seqq.

who have only farfetched points of similarity with the Hebrew prophets. That there were plenty of soothsayers in the home of astrology nobody will deny. "As they have come down to us," writes Johns, "the moral precepts of the Babylonian Prophets are almost entirely known to us from the Omen Tablets. These are conceived in a form which may be compared to the Books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. They consist in a series of short sentences following a stereotyped formula: 'When so and so takes place the consequence will be so and so.'" If the opinion expressed later on by the scholarly Assyriologist be true, we shall some day find long compositions which may be compared to the discourses of the prophets.

Until now nothing of the sort has been found. And at any rate the connection between the two would be merely literary. The superiority, the uniqueness of the Hebrew prophets,—the canonical prophets especially, but the men of God who went before them as well—lies not in the literary form of their writings and discourses, but in the very basis of their teaching: Monotheism, a lofty and pure morality, and, in the case of many of them, the Messianic idea. These will forever constitute their glory; nor will it be easy, or possible, to ascribe the origin of all these truths merely to the religious feelings of the Hebrews, developing under especially favorable conditions.

The more one examines the texts relating to Hebrew Prophetism before the eighth century, the more it becomes evident that there were of old in Israel two kinds of prophets: *the Nebi'im or prophets by free choice and voluntary consecration, and the men of God or prophets by special calling.*

H. Coppieters.

Louvain, Belgium.

[27]The eminent English assyriologist, C. H. W. Johns, has recently published an article on this subject in the April number of the *Interpreter*, 1906, under the heading: "The Prophets in Babylonia." In the work of O. Weber (*Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrier*, Leipzig, 1907), an entire chapter is devoted to the Omen Tablets, but no attempt is made to compare them with the prophetical literature of the Old Testament.

MONACHISM IN RUSSIA

P. Aurelio Palmieri, O.S.A.

"Monachism is a vigorous tree, which having been transplanted from Byzantium to Russian soil, soon took deep root and flourished exceedingly. The inner history of the Russian church is the story of its monasteries. In these we find the home of the nation's saints, the treasure houses of its science, sacred and profane, and the nurseries of its bishops. Kiev, the cradle of Russian Christianity, was in its beginnings simply a city of monks."[1] The metropolitan Hilarion (eleventh century) in his treatise on Law and Grace, places the foundation of the first Russian monasteries in the time of Vladimir the Great (972-1015), other writers assign it to the time of Jaroslav, (1015-1054),[2] It is safe to say that monks made their appearance in Russia very soon after the conversion of the people to Christianity. It is a recognized fact that the Byzantine missionaries drew their recruits chiefly from the monks, and it was among these that were naturally found the most zealous and disinterested preachers of the Gospel in ancient Russia. Organized monasteries, however, with large aggregations of monks did not appear and flourish until the eleventh century. One of the most famous of these communities is the Pecerskaia of Kiev, founded by Anthony, a Russian monk, born at Liubetch (village situated in the present province of Cernigov), and who for the purpose of initiating himself into the usages of monastic life spent several years in the monasteries of Mount Athos. The organizer of the monastic discipline in the same institution was another monk by the name of Theodosius, who established there the rule (typikon) of the monastery of the Studiti in Constantinople. So rapid was the progress made by monachism that soon eighteen communities were established in the city of Novgorod, fourteen at Kiev, seven at Vladimir, five at Smolensk, and four at Cernigov.

But the tree of monachism soon after its transfer to Russian soil developed symptoms of radical decay. The monks, according to Golubinsky, soon forgot that the aim proposed in the monastic

[1]Palmieri, *La Chiesa Russa, le sue Odierne Condizioni, ed il suo Riformismo Dottrinale*, Firenze, 1908, p. 105.

[2]Golubinsky, *The History of the Russian Church* (in Russian), Tom. I, Part I, Moscow, 1904, p. 553; *The Origins of Monachism in Russia*, in Supplement to the Russian Translation of the works of the Fathers, Vol. IX, Moscow, 1850, pp. 566-568.

life is the mortification of the flesh; that its spirit is the antithesis of the spirit of the world, the withdrawal from contact with things profane. The Russian monks in the period anterior to the invasion of the Mongols had already developed a partiality for sumptuous banquets. Documents of the time attest that they were frequently invited to such feasts by the laity, and that banquets at which women also assisted were given in the monasteries.[3] The example of Theodosius Petchersky, who was so frugal and abstemious, who, clad in ragged garments, labored with the simple monks, and who distributed among the poor the offerings received for his monastery, was soon lost sight of.[4]

The Russian princes and nobles began to bestow favors upon the monks with grants of landed property; opulence was followed by luxury, and the latter soon brought about corruption of morals. The national chronicler, Nestor, who records this princely generosity towards the monks, adds, however, that the monasteries founded by the nobles and enriched by them with the goods of this world, were far inferior to those which had risen out of poverty, tears and fasting.[5]

The intellectual and moral degradation of the Russian monks reached its lowest level in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The documents of that epoch furnish curious details relative to the condition of the monasteries and the worldly ideals of their inmates. These had become the most skilful merchants and traders of all Russia. Under Ivan, the Terrible, (1533-1584) the monastery of the Blessed Trinity at Astrakhan obtained a diploma granting an exclusive right to purchase and to sell salt and fish within the limits of that city, in Iaroslav and in Caluga. Still greater commercial privileges were conceded to the other famous monastery of the Blessed Trinity at Serghievo.[6] The monasteries acquired immense tracts of land: thus the last named institution possessed 10,000 acres, and the monasteries of Bielozero and of Volokolamps 12,000 each. As owners of the land, the monasteries began to have serfs after the manner of the nobles, and to practice a shameful usury.[7]

---

[3]Golubinsky, *op cit.* I, Part I, p. 645.

[4]Znamensky, *History of the Russian Church* (in Russian), St. Petersburg, 1878, p. 63.

[5]Znamensky, *op. cit.* p. 60.

[6]Solovev, *Istoriia Rossii*, Libro vii, c. 1.; Tom. ii, p. 397.

[7]*Our Monasteries, Their Wealth and Resources*, Besieda, St. Petersburg, 1872, March, p. 187.

With riches, too, came the indulgence of the baser passions, and documents of the sixteenth century testify that the archimandrites, the superiors, and the monks in general were so addicted to intemperance that the public functions in their churches had to be abandoned. The revenues of the monasteries were bestowed in great part on the relatives of the monks, nearly all of whom had illegitimate children.[8] The distilling of spirituous liquors was one of their principal occupations, and so great were the abuses that came from it that the Russian government was obliged several times to prohibit it, v. g., in 1681, 1688 and in 1694. The consumption of alcoholic beverages in the monasteries reached a figure which seems almost incredible. Arsenius Moghilansky, superior of the monastery of Serghievo, (1744-1752) obtained in the first year of his presidency, permission to buy in Russia Minor with exemption of state revenue 36,870 pounds of *vodka* (the Russian absynthe) per year for the use of his monks![9] It is not therefore to be wondered at that the inebriety of the Russian monks became proverbial, and that the people were wont to say sarcastically that in the monastic churches while one of the choirs sang, the other was carousing in a drinking bout. In short, the luxury and license of the monasteries became a downright scandal. A Russian writer tells us with regard to Gideon Krinovsky, archimandrite of the same monastery (1758-1761), that his garters and foot gear cost 10,000 rubles, and that his monks wore garments of silk and velvet with rich trimmings of gold and silver.[10]

This relaxation of morals naturally caused the people to lose respect for the monks, and the treasures accumulated in the monasteries excited the cupidity of the nobles and of the Czar, who were only too eager for an opportunity to confiscate them. In 1649 the Czar, Alexis Mihhailovitch (1645-1676), issued an ordinance restricting the monasteries in the acquisition of real estate. The monks and the "white" clergy raised a vigorous protest and under Theodore Alexicevitch (1676-1682) the law was repealed. In 1700 the wealth of the monasteries was so vast that in the province of Moscow alone 54,003 families of serfs were numbered among their possessions· the Czar and the nobles of the same province having 161,572. Peter the Great (1682-1725), in his efforts for the betterment of things in Russia, undertook the task of changing the organization and civil status of

[8]Solovev, Book xiii, c. i., t. iii, p. 738-739.
[9]Besieda, March, 1872, pp. 193-194.
[10]*Ibid.* p. 195.

the monasteries with a view to make use of a part of their revenues and property for military and philanthropic purposes. The example of this monarch, the "crowned carpenter," as Ruskin calls him, who, in his ukases, gave plentiful spiritual advice to the monks, is very interesting. He charges them with idleness, and warns them that idleness is the father of vice and discord in the monasteries; and he adds that the most of the monks adopt that form of life in order that they may be fed and clothed without having to work for a living.[11] He therefore imposed on the superiors of these institutions the obligation of not receiving more than a fixed number of novices; he made a rule forbidding postulants to be received under 30 years of age, and determined the form of the monastic dress. These and many other similar regulations make up the substance of the ukase of 1701, promulgated again with new rules and additions in 1724. His idea was to make the life of the monks more active, to employ them in the schools, to transform the monasteries into homes for orphans and for the infirm, hospitals, prisons for the *raskolniki* (Russian schismatics), etc.

Under the reign of Catherine I (1725-1727), and of Peter II (1727-1730), the strict legislation of Peter the Great with regard to the monks was somewhat mitigated, but it was renewed in the reign of Anna Ivanovna (1730-1741). The properties of several monasteries were confiscated; many of their pecuniary resources were cut off, and severe laws made the recruiting of postulants more and more difficult. For instance, a ukase of 1734 decreed that only widowed priests and soldiers discharged from service were allowed to embrace the monastic life. These repressive laws had such an effect that in 1740 the Synod of St. Petersburg complained to the empress of the depopulation of the monasteries and of their decadence.[12] Elizabeth Petrovna (1741-1762) brought back the regime of toleration and accorded favors and privileges to several monasteries, but Peter III showed himself openly hostile to the monks and their institutions. He decreed that each postulant before entering a monastery should obtain a special permission from the government, and he meditated a project of confiscation of all monastic property in the interests of the state. The empress, Catherine II (1762-1796), did not seem at

[11]Cistovitch, *Theophanus Procopovitch and His Times* (in Russian), St. Petersburg, 1868, pp. 139-146.

[12]Dobroklonsky, *History of the Russian Church* (in Russian), t. iv, Moscow, 1893, p. 423.

first to share the antipathies of her deceased consort, but this policy was adopted by the astute sovereign at the beginning of her reign in order to establish herself more firmly on the throne. No sooner was she secure from the dangers that threatened her than she began to show her true sentiments, and to carry out the plans matured by her husband. At that time the Russian monasteries numbered 953 houses, of which 221 were convents for nuns. The monks numbered 7,659 and the nuns 4,783. Catherine began by establishing an ecclesiastical commission composed of three clerical and five lay members, and to this body she assigned the charge of looking after the care and administration of the monastic property. Then in an ordinance issued February 12, 1764, she authorized the confiscation of the same property and its transfer to the state. In the decree she reproaches the monks, as by profession ignorant of the things of the world, with being incapable of administering their property and revenues, and declares that these are needed by the state in order to reward the zeal of faithful subjects, and to provide for the defence of the country. The Russian monasteries suffered on that occasion immense losses. Thus the institution at Serghievo was despoiled of its lands which gave employment to 151,000 serfs. The only Russian bishop who protested against this confiscation was Arsenius Matzievitch, metropolitan of Rostov, who, because of his vigorous protest, was imprisoned in the fortress of Revel where, after suffering many privations, he died in 1772.

But all this did not bring about the extinction of monachism in Russia. It revived under Paul I, who by a ukase of December 18, 1797, granted to each of the monasteries the right to possess thirty acres of tillable land. This grant was raised to fifty, and afterward to 150 acres under Nicholas I (1825-1855), in 1853. Under Alexander II (1855-1881), the monasteries continued to become wealthy chiefly through the legacies and the generosity of private individuals. Thus, for instance, in 1866 the princess Vasilcikova founded a new monastery near kiev, on which she bestowed her private domain, comprising 3,794 acres; and the monastery of St. Demetrius of Salonico, founded in the year 1867, in the district of Kharkov, received as a gift an estate of 4,434 acres. In 1869 the Russian monasteries numbered 520 and their possessions amounted to 156,000 acres of land. According to the latest statistics there are in Russia 682 monasteries, of which 362 are nunneries. The monks number 8,455, besides 6,691 novices; the nuns number 10,963, besides 32,029 novices. The nun-

neries are on the gain, because they have in part adopted the ideals and rules of Western monachism, and the nuns busy themselves with teaching and works of charity.

Of the monasteries for men four are distinguished beyond all the others on account of their importance and of the historical reminiscences connected with them. These are the monastery of Alexander Nevsky at St. Petersburg, that of Theodosius Pecersky at Kiev, that of the Blessed Trinity at Serghievo (at a distance of two hours by train from Moscow), and that of the Assumption at Pociaev. Seven other monasteries are called *Stauropegiaka*, and depend canonically directly on the Russian Synod. Five of these are in Moscow, one in the district of Arkhangelsk (*Solovetzky*) and one in the district of Jaroslav.[13]

The mode of life of the Russian monks is determined and regulated by an ensemble of ecclesiastical and civil laws, which, notwithstanding their number and complexity, are powerless to check the abuses which everywhere abound. In the first place the Russian monasteries, like those of Greece, are divided into *Koinobia* and *Idiorruthma*. In the first, community life is practised in its integrity; the monks take their meals together at the same table, and all that belongs to any of them or is the fruit of personal labor, belongs in reality to the monastery. In the others the monks retain in whole or in part the right of private ownership.[14] A decision of the Synod dated April 25, 1865, and confirmed January 22, 1870, decreed that all new monasteries, whether founded by the government or by private individuals, should adopt the usages of community life. Another decision of May 9, 1881, authorizes the foundation of new monasteries only in cases where the State will not be called upon to grant a subsidy for their maintenance.[15] Russian piety, however, is generous, and new monasteries are continually springing up, being founded and richly endowed by zealous laymen.

A synodal ukase issued in 1865 decreed that the monasteries, over and above the general end aimed at in monastic life, should busy themselves with works of benevolence and instruction. By a law of 1764 all Russian monasteries, whether *Koinobia* or *Idiorruthma*, were divided into two categories, viz. the *Chlatnye*, or those which receive support from the government, and the *Zachlatnye*, which subsist on

[13]Pavlov, *Treatise on Canon Law* (in Russian), Serghievo, 1902, p. 223.
[14]Sakellaropulos, *Ekklesiastikon Dikaion*, Athens, 1898, p. 298.
[15]Pavlov, *Course in Canon Law*, St. Petersburg, 1902, n. 1077, p. 222.

their own revenues without any subvention from the State. According to a ukase of the Synod issued in 1900 all juvenile delinquents were to be shut up in monasteries and applied to manual labor under the direction of experienced monks.[16] The Synod of St. Petersburg has always looked upon the transformation of the monasteries into prisons as an act of beneficence. The Byzantine monasteries were also places of forced confinement and expiation for those who had been unsuccessful pretenders to the throne, and for the deposed emperors, and in like manner, the Synod declares, the Russian monasteries should segregate from the outside world criminal children and also those priests who have been disobedient to the laws of the government and of the Synod.

The conditions of admission to the monastic life are as follows: The ordinary signs of a religious vocation, freedom of choice of a state of life, and good moral conduct. The postulants must have performed the required military service or have been exempted from it, and they must be free from conjugal ties and from indebtedness. By mutual consent a husband and wife may both embrace the monastic life provided they have no children still under age; it is required moreover that both be invested with the monastic habit on the same day. The novices are placed under the direction of an elderly monk who instructs them with regard to the divine law and their religious duties, as well as their obligations and duties of state, and watches over their moral conduct. If the latter is not in harmony with the ideals of the monastic life, the postulants (called Rasophoroi, because they are simply wearers of the religious garb) are expelled from the monastery, and thereafter they are forbidden to live in the towns or villages in which they have lived as monks.

The time of the novitiate is ordinarily three years, and if for any reason a novice asks to be transferred from one monastery to another, he is obliged to begin over again his three years' novitiate. This regular period, is, however, shortened in the case of novices who have already completed their theological studies in an ecclesiastical academy or seminary, and who besides, have attained the age of 25. The same favor is also granted to priests who are widowers, and to these generally a preference is given when it is question of admitting a limited number of novices to an institution. The monasteries whose inmates receive a stipendium from the government are allowed to receive novices

[16] Kalachnikov, *Alphabetical Index of the Ukases and Decisions of the Synod* (in Russian), 3d edition, St. Petersburg, 1902, n. 1077, p. 222.

only in sufficient numbers to fill the vacancies caused by mortality among the members, or to replace those who for one reason or another have been rendered incapable of fulfilling their regular duties. The other monasteries are regulated in the matter of admitting novices according to the extent of their resources.

From noviceship is distinguished the real profession of monastic life which entails the promise to observe the vows of chastity, poverty and obedience, and also to be faithful to residence in the monastery. There are many civil laws regulating the admission of novices to the community life of the monks. Thus the law requires that the male novices be thirty years of age and the females forty. The right to permit a novice to embrace the monastic life as a professed religious is reserved to the bishop of the diocese who appoints an ecclesiastical commission to examine the candidate's papers, to ascertain that the three years' novitiate have been duly completed, and that no canonical impediment stands in the way of his or her profession The ceremony of reception is performed by the superior of the monastery. In making out their annual reports for their respective districts, the diocesan bishops are obliged to notify the Synod of the number of persons, who have embraced the religious life in the monasteries located in the territory under their jurisdiction. In every monastery are to be found a certain number of men who have been promoted to sacred orders. This is necessary for the integral carrying out of the liturgical offices, and among the monks a selection is made of those who are conspicuous for their piety and learning, and they are ordained deacons and priests. The former are called "hierodiaconi" and the latter "hieromonaci" in order to distinguish them from the priests and deacons of the secular or "white" clergy.[17]

Russian monachism comprises metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, archimandrites, rectors, *stroiteli* or superiors, and simple monks. It thus contains an aristocratic element invested with the spiritual authority (*dukhovnyia vlasti*) and the simple monks who form the monastic democracy. Among those invested with spiritual authority are the hieromonaci who are rectors and prefects in the seminaries, and the hiermononaci of the four more noted monasteries mentioned above, to whom are entrusted the functions of procurator, treasurer, confessor, sacristan, etc. Especially with regard to the rights concerning property, those who belong to the aristocracy enjoy certain privileges that are not granted to the simple monks. The latter as a

[17]Pavlov, *op. cit.* p. 219.

rule cannot acquire property either by contract or by right of hereditary succession. Prior to their admission to the monastery they are obliged to legally abdicate their property rights in favor of the other legitimate heirs,[18] and this act of renunciation is final. If later on the monk loses his vocation and returns to secular life, the law of the land gives him no authority to reclaim the property which he voluntarily gave up.[19] If public functionaries, ecclesiastical, civil or military, embrace the monastic life, they forfeit the right to any pension they may have been receiving as a reward for their services. The vow of poverty is more rigorously observed in the monastieres where community life is the rule than in the *Idiorruthma.* In the former the monks are deprived of the right of possession with regard to personal property as well as real estate; in the latter, though the possession of real estate is forbidden, the monks are allowed to retain the possession and usufruct of any titles or bonds, etc., which were theirs prior to their religious profession.[20] In case of decease, if there be no will or testament, such property by law reverts to the monastery. The monks are forbidden to receive deposits or loans, to accept positions as tutors or procurators, to engage in commerce or other secular pursuits or to receive legacies. The sale, however, of objects fabricated by the monks is allowed provided due permission is granted by the superiors.

The right to own property and to transmit the same by testamentary disposition is granted to the monks who are invested with spiritual authority, as described above, and to the sacristan of the synodal house of Moscow. The bishops and the superiors of monasteries may dispose of their goods by testament, but not in favor of their relatives, since the revenues, etc., administered by them constitute ecclesiastical property. The relatives can claim only certain objects personally used by the deceased monk, such as crucifixes adorned with precious stones, etc. Being by profession separated from the world, the monks lose the right to administer the sacraments, as this prerogative is reserved to the parochial clergy. The monks are forbidden to contract marriage, and if in spite of the law they do so, they are punished as bigamists. Once they have taken up the monastic life they are no longer free to release themselves from their vows. In the case of a monk who would have completely lost his

[18]Kalachnikov, *op. cit.* n. 1107, p. 228.

[19]*Ibid.* n. 1110-1111, p. 229.

[20]Suvorov, *Manual of Canon Law, Iaroslav,* 1898, p. 460.

vocation, he is allowed to ask to be dispensed from his obligations, after which during a period of six months he is exhorted to withdraw his request. These exhortations are addressed to him first by the superior and the elders of the monastery, then by persons delegated by the bishop, and finally by the ecclesiastical council. If he still persists, he receives permission to leave the monastery and return to his former station in life. But after his return to the condition of a layman he still remains subject to an ecclesiastical punishment or disability which lasts seven years. During this interval he is debarred from service in any department of civil or ecclesiastical administration, nor can he take up his abode in the province in which the monastery where he took the garb is located, nor even in St. Petersburg or Moscow. He has no right to reclaim the property which he gave up when entering religion, nor can he resume any titles or honorific marks of distinction which he had previously acquired.[21] It must be added nevertheless that the rigor of these laws has to some extent been relaxed, for it not rarely happens nowadays that monks who have laid aside the habit and priests who have given up their functions are admitted as employees in the service of the Synod. Formerly the observance of these prohibitive laws was so strict that for instance, the celebrated Russian theologian and exegete, Theodore Bucharev († 1871) having left his monastery to take a wife, was constrained to live and die in abject want.

As a rule the Russian monks live steadily in the same monastery. Changes from one monastery to another are forbidden except in special cases where the common good is concerned. When travelling the monks must be provided with special passports which are examined by the ecclesiastical authorities. Superiors, however, are allowed to make a journey of twenty furlongs from their monastery without being obliged to produce a passport, and they have the power to send their subordinates into the neighboring towns and villages on business connected with the monastery. If, however, it be question of going to a town in another district, a special permission is required from the diocesan authorities, and in the absence of the bishop it is granted by the ecclesiastical council. The passports should indicate the name of the place to which the bearer is going and the length of time he is allowed to remain, in order that he may not stay away from his monastery beyond the time allotted. Only the monasteries called Stauropegiaka enjoy the privilege of sending their monks into

[21] Kalachnikov, *op. cit.* n. 2172-2175, p. 428-429.

other districts without a special permission on the part of the bishop. There are special regulations for the examination of passports when the traveller's destination is either St. Petersburg or Moscow. It lies within the discretionary power of the bishops to allow the monks to go in pilgrimage to the Holy Land or to Mount Athos, or to go outside the country for reasons of study.[22]

The monasteries are governed by superiors who, according to dignity, are either archimandrites or simple rectors. A manifesto of February 26, 1764, divided the monasteries into three categories: those of the first and second class are governed by archimandrites, those of the third by rectors. It may be noted in passing that when the simple hieromonaci are promoted to the office of rector of seminaries or of ecclesiastical academies, they receive at the same time the title of archimandrite. The election of superiors in the monasteries where community life is followed is determined by a vote of all the monks who have made profession and taken their vows. The so-called *Blagotchinny* of the monastery assists at the election, and in his absence his place is taken by a delegate on the part of the bishop. The superior is chosen from among the monks living in the monastery, but for grave reasons the candidate may be taken from some other house. In the monasteries where community life is not practised superiors are chosen by the diocesan authorities or by the Synod, according to the rank of the institution in question. In the four most important monasteries the superior is aided in his administration by a council whose members are elected by the monks.[23]

An important official function in Russian monachism is that of the *Blaggocinnyi*. Such is the name given to the superior of a monastery, who on account of his wisdom and prudence is selected by the diocesan authority to exercise a certain surveillance over all the monasteries of the district. The naming of this personage, who performs the function of Visitor in the Latin church, is reserved to the bishop of the diocese. The *Blaggocinnyi* are bound to visit once or twice a year the monasteries within their jurisdiction and to take cognizance of the condition of things as regards the administration, the liturgical functions, morality of the monks, etc. Thus they examine if the divine offices are performed regularly and properly and if all the monks are faithful to attend them; if the rules regarding

[22]Provolovitch, *Collection of the Laws Pertaining to the Monks* (in Russian) Serghievo, 1902, p. 35-70.

[23]Pavlov, *op cit.*. p. 225.

silence, labor, community life, obedience, etc., are properly observed; if the books, accounts, titles, etc., of the monastery are kept in order; if abuses of any kind are creeping in, etc. A detailed report of what they have found in each visit is submitted to the diocesan authorities. In some cases the local ecclesiastical law requires that the monks, instead of being visited in their monastery, go in a body to the town where the *Blaggocinnyi* resides and there the investigation takes place. In things spiritual the monks are directly subject to their superiors, particularly to the *Staretz* of the monastery, an elderly monk who acts as spiritual director, and to whom they declare the things pertaining to their inner lives—their temptations, secret thoughts, doubts, sins, aspirations, etc. The *Staretz* is sometimes the superior, sometimes the father confessor of the monastery. He regulates the frequency of communion according to the occurrence of the liturgical feasts and the spiritual needs of the monks, and likewise he controls their ascetic practices of mortification and prayer. At the stated hours for the recitation of the divine office one of the monks goes around to the cells of all the others to notify them to be present, and he is charged to take note of any who fail to come. At the end of the recitation they file past the superior and receive his blessing. In church the monks occupy a special inclosure or choir to which the faithful are not admitted. The monks are summoned to their meals by the sound of a bell. Flesh meats never form a part of the bill of fare, and so strict is the law of abstinence that even the bishops are obliged to observe it. It is strictly forbidden to bring food to the cell of the monks, except when on account of sickness or old age a permission is given to that effect by the superior. The free time spent by the monks in their cells should be devoted to prayer, or the perusal of ascetic works, or the copying of the same, or to exercises in singing and reading, or to labor prescribed by the superior. The spiritual writings most recommended or use by the monks are the Holy Scriptures, the lives of the saints, the works of St. Basil, of St. John Climachus, of St. Ephrem Sirus, of Macarius of Egypt and of Nilus Sorsky. The reading of historical and scientific works is allowed by way of recreation, but novels and dramatic writings are strictly forbidden. The younger members are advised to take up the study of religious painting. Simplicity, but nevertheless neatness of dress is recommended by the rule; the cells should be without worldly ornaments but clean, and in this last respect they differ from those of the monasteries of Mount Athos which are rarely if ever swept or scrubbed.

The monks are not allowed to retain in their possession any alcoholic stimulants. They are allowed to visit one another without obtaining a special permission, but it is the duty of the superior to keep an eye on this aspect of the monastic life, and if he perceives that certain visits are too frequent or otherwise detrimental to the regularity or spiritual well being of the parties concerned, he must interfere to prevent them. Immediately after supper the monks retire in silence to their respective cells for the night. Other ordinances embodied in the Synodal ukase of September 4, 1852, determine the rules to be observed regarding visits, the reception of guests, absences from the monastery, public penances, etc.[24] The ensemble of these regulations goes to show that in substance the monastic traditions of the Eastern church have been maintained in Russia, but in practice unfortunately, with the exception of a few monasteries, these traditions and rules are more or less a dead letter. Monachism consequently has fallen so low in point of moral decay that even the more fervent and enthusiastic among the Orthodox believers look upon it as a subject of scandal, and they demand either its suppression or a radical reform. The principal cause of this decadence, according to these writers is the wealth of the monasteries, together with the license allowed to the monks of the most important centres to own property and dispose of it without restraint. Following the confiscation of 1764 the monasteries, after a brief economic crisis, began little by little to reconstruct their lost patrimonies. Paul I, by a ukase of December 18, 1797, authorized each of the monasteries to acquire thirty acres of tillable land. In 1838 permission was granted to possess from fifty to a hundred and fifty acres. The monks took advantage of these permissions, and from 1838 to 1861 the rural property of the monasteries was increased to the extent of 10,000 acres of wooded lands and 9,000 acres of tillable soil. These holdings have been much increased by gifts from private individuals, and at present, according to those who are unfriendly to the monasteries, these institutions possess an aggregate of two millions of acres of tillable land, while the peasants of the same regions, obliged to eke out a living from small farms, are suffering from hunger.

On the other hand, the official statistics compiled by the Synod of St. Petersburg give a much lower estimate of the rural property held by the monasteries. According to these statistics which were

[24]Provolovitch, *op. cit.* p. 83-100.

followed by Liubinetzky,[25] in 1890 690 monasteries possessed in the aggregate 496,308 acres of land, of which 75,900 acres were set down as not being tillable.[26] According to the latest available statistics the lands possessed by the monasteries amount to 585,925 acres.[27] The publications which are the organs of the 'white" clergy maintain that these vast domains are useless to the monks, and they urge the government to confiscate them in order to bestow them on charitable and educational institutions The *Tzerkovny V estnik*, published by the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg, argues openly that it would be no violation of justice to take these possessions away from the monks, who by profession are supposed to live in poverty, and employ them to alleviate the misery and distress of the "white" clergy who are burdened with the support of their families.[28] The socialists, on the other hand, describe in lurid colors the indigence of the Russian peasants and advocate the division among them of the lands now held by the monasteries.

But the tillable lands are not the only source of monastic wealth in Russia. Many of the religious houses receive subsidies from the government. The manifesto of 1764, when authorizing the confiscation of the property of the monks, assigned to the various houses by way of compensation yearly pensions in the form of money in sums varying from 375 to 2,017 rubles per monastery of the first and second class In 1797, Paul I granted to all indiscriminately a yearly subvention of 85 to 116 rubles. In 1839, the public funds distributed among the monasteries amounted to 148,000 rubles, and in 1863 they reached the sum of 303,000. The monastery of Alexander Newsky in St. Petersburg, and that of the Blessed Trinity of Serghievo received each 6,000 rubles annually. After the promulgation in 1861 of the edict freeing the serfs, the monasteries received an indemnity amounting to 168,200 rubles. In 1890 the monasteries received 425,000 rubles of government funds, and at present the yearly sum allotted to them is 500,000. Thus, notwithstanding their vast properties, the

[25] *The Landed Properties of the Churches and Monasteries in the Russian Empire* (in Russian), St. Petersburg, 1890.

[26] "The Amount of Ecclesiastical and Monastic Property" in the *Tzerkovnyia Viedomosti*, 1906, n. 27, p. 2200-2201.

[27] Article "Ecclesiastical Lands" in the *Tzerkovnyia Viedomosti*, 1906, n. 25, p. 2122.

[28] Mychtzyn, article "Expropriation of the Monastery Lands" in the *Tzerkovny Viestnik*, 1906, n. 21, col. 665-668.

Russian monks receive substantial contributions from the funds of the state.[29]

Besides the lands, the monasteries often possess houses from the rental of which considerable sums are realized. Thus the great monastery Alexander Newsky of St. Petersburg owns a dozen palaces situated near by. The monasteries frequented by pilgrims maintain hostelries, the rooms of which are rented at the rate of from 75 kopeks to 2 and even 3 rubles per day. The pilgrims themselves are for the most part a continual source of revenue. The monastery of Pecerskaia of Kiev, and that of the Blessed Trinity at Serghievo are visited each year by hundreds of thousands of pilgrims, all of whom leave behind them money for the *Prosphorai*, or stipend which is offered by the people to the orthodox priests for the celebration of the Mass, and also wax candles, besides spending money for mages, sacred objects, etc. Pilgrimages constitute the most important and universal element in Russian works of piety and many of the most celebrated monasteries are able to live on the offerings of the pilgrims. Besides the two above mentioned, the following are worthy of notice: that of Sarov, noted for the possession of the relics of the famous ascetic Seraphinus, who died in 1833, and who was canonized by the Russian church in 1903; that of Blessed Nilus, founded in 1515 on the little island of Stolobnoc, in Lake Seliger; that of Solovetzk on an island at the entrance of the bay of Onega, founded in the first half of the fifteenth century; that of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin in the province of Kursk, founded in 1597; that of Jouriev (Novgorod) founded, it is claimed, in the ninth century; that of St. Metrophanus (1703) of Voroneje: that of St. Tychonus of Zadonsk, who died in 1783, and was canonized in 1861.

Another source of revenue for the monasteries are the solemn offices for the dead, and memorial services for the faithful departed. Services of this kind in some of the principal institutions are very expensive, costing as much as a thousand rubles. There is also the concession of burial places within the precincts of the monastery. A plot for a first class tomb in the cemetery of the monastery of Alexander Newsky costs from 500 to 1,000 rubles. Chapels located at the entrance of the monasteries are turned to pecuniary profit, especially in Moscow. In this city the revenue derived from the chapel of the Madonna of Iviron is estimated at 100,000 rubles yearly. Taking into account these various sources of gain—and we omit several minor

[29]Znamensky, *History of the Russian Church*, St. Petersburg, 1904, p. 469.

ones, such as fisheries, saw-mills, etc.,—it is not surprising to find that there are some monasteries in Russia enjoying an income of 300,000 rubles per year. These vast revenues are spent for the most part, according to the writers hostile to the monks, in satisfying the vicious appetites of corrupt men. It is worth noting that in Russia the priestly or monastic life is not generally chosen because of a recognized vocation from on High, or with the purpose of dedicating oneself to the service of God and the salvation of souls; the bishops themselves and the rectors of seminaries are the first to acknowledge it. Seminarians as a rule reluctantly decide to embrace the ecclesiastical state, being moved only by the motive of gaining a livelihood. The same happens in the monasteries; the monks make their religious profession chiefly because in the world they would be obliged to work, a thing which is not necessary in religion.[30] The *Ecclesiastical and Social Life*, a periodical published at Kazan, and which was suppressed by the state censors in 1907, has the following passage on the subject under discussion: "The Russian monasteries exist at present for the sole purpose of nourishing the sinful flesh of the monks who inhabit them. The number of the monks is ever growing because there they find a well laden table which requires on their part neither toil nor preoccupation, a circumstance amply sufficient to attract a multitude of idlers. And besides, the monasteries are rich, and in proportion as the monks are better fed and clothed the lazier they become, thus swelling the number of those who enter religion in order to have an easy living."[31]

Nicholas Alexandrovitch Blagoviechtchensky, a Russian writer, thus describes by way of contrast the austere life led by the monks of Mount Athos. "They eat a little bread, together with a vegetable soup; many subsist solely on herbs, and their only drink is a little wine mingled with water. Their cells reflect nothing but poverty, and only once a year is permission granted to give them a cleaning. The monks are not allowed to wash themselves; it is only when the skin is attacked by the itch that the use of a bath is permitted. The monks assist at public religious functions that last ten hours and more at a time."[32]

We confess that we are inclined to accept with the proverbial grain of salt this striking picture of the monastic austerity which

[30] Ilinsky, *On the Causes of the Moral Decadence in the Monasteries*, Tzerkovno-obchtchestvennaia jizn, Kazan, 1906, n. 44, col. 1447.

[31] *Wordly Ideals and Sombre Realities*, 1906, n. 44, col. 1457.

[32] *Mount Athos*, St. Petersburg, 1864, n. 20, 92-95.

prevails on Mount Athos The Russian monks who are established there to the number of 3,000 have introduced certain ways of living that are anything but monastic, and Joachim III, Patriarch of Constantinople, was obliged to stigmatize in a public document the scandals which were profaning this antique sanctuary of the Orthodox church. But whatever be the truth concerning the real condition of things on Mount Athos, it is a deplorable fact that the Russian monasteries, with a few honorable exceptions, are far from imitating the traditions connected with this stronghold of Eastern Monachism. In some of the monasteries the monks are paid as if they were members of the Russian bureaucracy. In the more important institutions, for instance in that of Newsky, they receive 1,000 rubles per year, and in other places 500, while the superiors receive a much greater stipend; thus the archimandrites of Newsky are paid 3,000 rubles a year. The rectors of certain monasteries receive an annual stipend which varies from 5,000 to 10,000 rubles. It seems hardly possible to believe the assertions made by the periodical *Ecclesiastical and Social Life*, mentioned above, concerning the monks of the Hermitage of St. Sergius, located near St. Petersburg, on the shore of the gulf of Finland. It states that the superior receives annually the fabulous sum of 30,000 rubles, adding that it is better to pass over in silence the scandals there enacted.[33] In many of the monasteries the vow of chastity is disregarded; the monks have their illegitimate wives who are designated in Russian by the name *tchernitzy*. The periodicals which are the organs of the "white" clergy cite characteristic instances of the continual violation of this grave obligation of the religious life.[34]

Bastards swarm in the neighborhood of the monasteries, nor is that all, for, strange to say, the monasteries themselves have in many instances degenerated into gambling dens. In 1907, Father Eliodorus, an archimandrite of the monastery of Nevsky, committed suicide as a result of losses sustained by gambling in his own community. Facts like these naturally contribute to the formation of a public opinion hostile to monachism as an institution, and it is curious to note that the chief efforts against it are made by the "white" or secular clergy who hate the monks, not so much because of their wealth as because they retain the monopoly of the higher dignities and posts of honor in the Russian church.

---

[33] *Ibid.* n. 31 (1906), col. 1040-1041.

[34] *Ibid.* n. 44, col. 1447.

It is only fair to state that not all of the accusations against the monks to be met with in the Russian periodicals are to be taken at their face value, or that they are to be indiscriminately generalized even when true. There are still to be found in Russia certain oases of ascetic monks who practice great austerities. There are to be found some small monasteries which have retained the spirit as well as the letter of the best cenobitic traditions; where the monks give themselves up to hard labor, where long hours are spent in the public recitation of the divine office, where the monks live in real seclusion from the world and reproduce in their lives the customs of the ancient monasteries.[35] But these, unfortunately, are but rare exceptions, and as is nearly always the case, the virtues practised in these isolated houses are witnessed only by a few, whereas the laxity of morals and discipline which prevails in the more famous and more populous monastic institutions is of public notoriety, and renders monachism itself odious not only to the cultured classes, but to the common people as well. It is rarely that one meets in Russia any one who speaks well of the monks as a class. One reason for this is that they are recruited from the lowest classes of the population, from the grossottish peasants who are often as fanatical as they are ignorant. The admirable development of scientific as well as charitable works which is the just pride of Western monachism is totally wanting in Russia. Monachism in that country is an inert factor, contributing nothing whatever to the Christian education of society. The only ground on which it might be defended would be that is is still a nursery and school of bishops and of seminary rectors. It furnishes the candidates for the Russian hierarchy and a nucleus of workers in matters pertaining to the sacred sciences. But these circumstances are precisely those which contribute the most to make monachism odious and bring it into discredit. The truth of this assertion will be shown in a forthcoming article on the Russian episcopate, the members of which, according to the canon law of the land, are obliged to embrace the monastic life before receiving the episcopal consecration.

P. Aurelio Palmieri, O. S. A.

---

[35] *The Spirit and Merit of Monachism With Reference to the Church and to Society* (in Russian), St. Petersburg, 1874, p. 50-52.

THE DHAMMA OF BUDDHA

A. Roussel

The Samyuttaka-Nikaya (towards the end) relates that one day when Buddha was sitting in the woods of Sinsapas, he took up some leaves and asked his disciples whether there were more leaves in his hand than in the whole forest. In the forest, they answered. Then the Blessed One declared that in the same way the truths he had revealed to them were as nothing in number, when compared with those he had held back. As a matter of fact, he had taught them three things: the origin of pain, its abolition, and the means to this end. Other features of Buddhistic philosophy we shall discuss later, but the main consideration is that of Pain or Sorrow. First let us see Buddha's own views of the place of pain in life:

"The transmigration of Beings (Samsara) has its origin in eternity. It is impossible to find the moment of time at which beings wrapped in ignorance and bound by the thirst for existence began to wander at haphazard from migration to migration. Which is greater, disciples, the mass of waters contained in the four great oceans or that of the tears which have flowed from your eyes during the long voyage as you wander at haphazard from migration to migration, having for your lot what you hate, and not having for your lot what you love? . . .The death of a mother, of a father, of a brother, a sister, a son, a daughter, the loss of relatives, the loss of goods—all this through the long ages you have experienced. And whilst, during the long ages, you have suffered these trials, there have flowed from your eyes more tears. . .than there are waters in the four great oceans."

In another place we are told of a heart-broken mother who went about calling over and over the name of her dead daughter: "Jiva! Jiva!' The answer comes to her: "Eighty-four thousand girls named Jiva have been buried in this very place. For which of them do you mourn?" As is evident, such a consideration is not calculated to assuage a mother's grief; it is intended to show the emptiness of things here below, and the folly of those who attach themselves to them even by the most legitimate ties, such as those which unite mother and child.

King Mounda of Patalipoutta had lost his beloved wife, Bhadda. His grief was profound. By way of consolation the Bhikku Narada thus addressed him:

"There are five things which neither Samana nor Brahman, nor god, nor Mara, nor Brahma, nor anyone in the world can do. What are these five things? That what is subject to age will not grow old, that what is subject to illness will not become ill, that what is subject to death will not die, that what is subject to ruin will not fall into ruin, that what is subject to cessation will not cease."

To give a final touch to this picture of the instability of human affairs over which Buddhism lingers almost affectionately, we cite some stanzas culled by Oldenberg from the Dhammapada:

'How can you be gay, how can you give yourselves up to pleasure? Forever the flames burn. The darkness surrounds you—will you not seek the light? Man gathers flowers, all his thoughts are on pleasure. Just as on a village in the night the floods come down, so death comes upon him and sweeps him away. Man gathers flowers all his thoughts are on pleasure. Man of unquenchable desires, the Destroyer holds him in his power. Neither in the kingdom of the air nor in the midst of the sea, nor if you go down into the depths of the mountains will you find on earth a place where the power of Mara will not reach you....Of joy is born pain; of joy is born fear. He who is freed from joy, for him there is no pain; whence can fear come to him? Of love is born pain, of love is born fear, etc., etc....He who bends his eyes upon the world as if he looked upon a bubble of froth, as if he looked upon a dream, he escapes the eyes of sovereign Death....He who has mounted above the evil and difficult path of the Samsara, of wanderings astray, he who has crossed over and reached the other shore, rich in contemplation, sans longing, sans weakness, he who, being freed from existence, has found extinction—he is whom I call a true Brahman."[1]

However, Oldenberg is of opinion that it is fundamentally wrong to ascribe to Buddhist pessimism as its characteristic mark a profound and incurable melancholy. In support of his opinion he quotes these stanzas from the Dhammapada:

"He whose senses are in repose like steeds completely curbed by their driver, he who has stripped off all pride, who is freed from

[1]We can infer from this last word that the true Buddhist and the true Brahman are one and the same. Indeed, only the Brahmans could be in circumstances to practise the exercises of meditation, etc. The other castes were too much occupied with external affairs to have leisure for such matters.

all impurity, he who is thus perfected is an object of envy to the very gods. In perfect joy we live, without enemies in a world of enmity.... In perfect joy we live, healthy amidst the sick....In perfect joy we live, unwearied amidst the weary....In perfect joy live we to whom naught belongs. Gayety is food to us as to the radiant gods. The monk living in a solitary spot, but with his soul full of peace, tastes of a superhuman happiness, gazing face to face upon the truth."

From this the above mentioned author concludes: "It is not enough to say that the end towards which the Buddhist aims in order to escape pain is Nirvana. We should also note as a fact proved beyond doubt the interior joyousness, far removed from resignation, with which he seeks this end."

Here, if anywhere, applies the dictum that he who proves too much proves nothing Buddhism, like every other system that has pessimism for its basis, was not, if I may use the expression, the philosophy of gayety. It is not when one has wept and is weeping more tears than the four seas can hold that one is born to laughter; unless indeed it be as a reaction from the ceaseless pangs of sorrow, as in the sudden outbursts of gayety in melancholy persons who are trying to stifle their troubles. Such joy is fictitious and fleeting.

THE TRUTHS ON THE ORIGIN AND SUPPRESSION OF PAIN.

Here we come to the most obscure and complicated part of Buddhist speculation. First of all we shall quote two stanzas, of which the rest is only a development:

"Behold, O monks, the holy truth on the origin of pain: it is the thirst (for existence) which leads from rebirth to rebirth, accompanied by pleasure and desire, which finds its pleasure here and there; the thirst for pleasures, the thirst for existence, the thirst for the unabiding."

"Behold, O monks, the holy truth on the suppression of pain; the extinction of this thirst by the complete annihilation of desire, by banishing desire, by renouncing it, by getting freed from it, by leaving it no room."

The whole metaphysic of Buddhism is contained in these few lines; in fact it can be summed up in one word—*desire.*

The final goal of this teaching is non-existence (later on we shall see whether this is synonymous with nothingness); and non-existence is reached by the suppression of the sole cause of existence: *desire.*

A twofold series of propositions will help us to understand what may be called the *processus* and *recessus*, the flow and ebb of the vicissitudes of the Ego before, during, and after its existence—the double chain of causes and effects:

"From ignorance come the formations (Sandaras); from the formations come cognition (Vinnana); from cognition come name and body; from name and body come the six domains (the six senses and their objects—the sixth sense for the Hindoos was Manas or the organic senses); from the six domains comes contact (between the senses and outer objects); from contact comes sensation; from sensation comes desire (or more literally thirst—Tauha); from thirst comes attachment (to existence); from attachment to existence comes existence (Chava); from existence comes birth; from birth come old age and death, suffering and lamentation, sorrow, disappointment and dispair Such is the origin of the whole empire of pain."[2]

So much for ignorance and its effects. Now for the effects of knowledge, or the suppression of ignorance. We know beforehand what we shall find—a reversal of the first. "If ignorance is suppressed by the total abolition of desire (or concupiscence), this suppression leads to that of the formations; by the suppression of the formations, cognition is suppressed...by the suppression of birth are suppressed old age and death, suffering and murmuring, sorrow, disappointment and despair. Such is the suppression of the whole empire of pain."

I have compared this twofold series, positive and negative, to the flow and ebb of the sea. One leads from birth to birth, ever pro-

[2]The phraseology is difficult to understand. The difficulty is certainly due in part to the obscurity and subtilty of the philosophy itself. Partly also, no doubt, it is due to our lack of thorough understanding of the value of the terms. European scholars are often at sea in these matters, and the Hindoo Pundits do not seem to be able to find equivalents in Western languages for the terminology of Buddhistic metaphysics. However, we shall try to clear up one or two expressions. "Cognition" (which does not mean knowledge or science) is one of the six elements enumerated by Buddha—the elements of earth, water, fire, air, ether, and cognition. It is called "the unmanifested, the infinite, the all-illuminating, in which neither earth nor water, fire nor air find place; that in which greatness and littleness, weakness and strength, name and body cease completely," This is not very clear, to say the least; nor is it clear why "name and body" are produced by "cognition," and also, as we now find, disappear in it.

As for the latter expressions, the "name" is said to be the domain of the sensations, representations, and formations." The "body" seems to mean the four elements; but they speak of it as distinct from them: "the four elements and the body (rupa)"—unless indeed we may translate this as "the four elements and their *forms*."

gressing and spreading over wider and wider fields of time and space; the other returns unceasingly on its steps, unfolding upon itself, and moves towards non-existence, the starting-point and final goal of all things.

KAMMA.

The theory that each one of us finds himself on the earth in such or such conditions of social rank, wealth, health, etc., by reason of conduct more or less conformed to the Law, or Dhamma, in a previous existence, is borrowed from the system of Brahmanism. The latter always taught that the Karman or Work created for each his destiny through the series of existence which must be traversed before reaching Nirvana. There are differences in the full development of the idea in the two systems, but for the present it is sufficient to state that the Buddhistic Kamma is the Karman of Brahmanism.

The transmigration of souls operates in five regions: the world of the gods, that of men, of ghosts, of animals, and in the lower regions. When the sinner dies his soul is brought to the tribunal of Yama. The latter proceeds to the trial of the culprit, and asks him whether, during his life, he has not seen the five messengers of heaven. What messengers? asks the poor wretch. Childhood, age, sickness, the chastisements of human justice, and finally death are the messengers. Then Yama goes on: "And hast thou not, O man, thus thought within thyself: I too am subject to birth, old age and death; I am not beyond the dominion of birth, old age and death; therefore I should do right in thought, word, and deed."

The culprit stammers: "I could not, Lord. In my frivolousness I neglected it, Lord." "Well," replies Yama, "these evil actions are thine own; they were not committed by thy mother, nor thy father, nor thy brother, thy sister, thy friends, thy relatives and connections nor by the ascetics, nor the Brahmans, nor the gods. Thou alone hast committed them, and thou alone shall reap the fruit."

After this sentence the sinner is led to the place of expiation, where, by dreadful tortures, be is made to pay his debt to divine justice even to the last farthing. After this complete expiation it might be expected that the sinner would have nothing more to fear from his Kamma. But not so. The Kamma throws him back into life, where cognition, combining anew with name and body, puts him in contact with the external world by means of the six senses. Then are produced the sensations which enkindle this fatal thirst, the cause of

attachment to the external world, and consequently of the supreme evil of rebirth. This is the wheel of Samsara, the terrible circle which turns under the impulse of desire, and ceases only with the complete cessation of desire, or of attachment to the things of this world.

This theory, as stated in the philosophy of Brahmanism, may be summarized thus: The Paramatman, in order to re-create himself, or for some other motive, for he need render an account to no one for his actions, sends forth from his bosom the Jivatmans, as the spider spins his web. But there the comparison ceases. Launched into the whirlpool of existence, it is for each of these Jivatmans to swim for itself and to escape as soon as it can. Its Karman will decide its fate. It is this Karman, born of the living being, which will condemn the being to new existences. The gods themselves cannot hinder its action. It is a fruit which, be it bitter or sweet, must be plucked and eaten by him who planted the tree. This series of existences is then a sort of purgatory through which each Jivatman must pass until at length it is reunited to the Paramatman, the Great All of Brahmanism.

Oldenberg is of opinion that there is a difference between the metaphysical basis of the two systems. "In every becoming," he says, "the speculation of the Brahmans seizes the being; in every seeming being that of the Buddhists seizes the becoming. There, substance without causality; here, causality without substance."

Since for Buddha nothing exists and all things pass, he does not consider the first principal end its final consequence as a reality, but merely as a law. Concerning this law we know its existence; but we know nothing of its origin or duration; nor can we set any limits to it in time or in space. The answer given on this question to over-curious disciples was: "The Sublime One has not revealed it." More than that, the Sublime One forbade spending time and thought over it, as being insoluble and useless; better fix attention on the vital questions, on those problems alone which are of importance and which are possible of settlement. "O disciples, do not have thoughts as the world has: 'The world is eternal' or 'The world is not eternal'; 'The world is finite,' or 'The world is infinite.' When you think, disciples, let your thoughts be: 'This is pain; This is the origin of pain; This is the cessation of pain; This is the way which leads to the cessation of pain.'"

From this it seems not improbable that all the complex system of metaphysics which we have seen was foreign to primitive Buddhism;

that Gautama had no knowledge of it at all, but confined himself to moral practical speculations within reach of all; and that, later on, his followers, becoming more numerous, and seeing that other religious had a philosophical scaffolding, erected one for themselves and attributed it to their founder.

THE SOUL.

Soul and body are for Buddhism a double series of phenomena of sensations, of transformations which succeed one another and form a ceaseless becoming. The "cognition" which presides over all this ebb and flow, much as consciousness in our philosophy presides over our acts and takes account of them, is itself but a phenomenon, a *sankhara*, as changeable and fleeting as the rest. For Buddhism, in short, there are sensations with objects, but without subjects: sight and things seen—but no seer.

The famous "Questions of Milinda" leave no doubt on this point. This is a dialogue between the king of the Yavanas, better known under the name of Menander (2nd cent. B. C.) and the monk Nagasena.

The prince questions Nagasena: "How art thou called, reverend sir? What is thy name?"

"I am called Nagasena, great king; but Nagasena is only a name, a denomination, a designation, an expression, a mere word. It finds no corresponding subject here."

Replies the king: "Very well! Let the five hundred Yavanas and the eighty thousand monks attend—here is Nagasena who says, 'It finds no corresponding subject here.' Can such a statement be allowed to pass? If, Nagasena, there be no subject, who is it then that provides for your needs, clothes and food, a dwelling-place and medicines for sickness? Who is it that enjoys all these things? Who is it that lives in virtue? Who that labors for perfection? Who that enters upon the way and plucks the fruits of holiness? Who is it that reaches Nirvana. Who is it that slays? that steals? that lives for pleasure? that dies? Who is it that drinks? Who that commits the five mortal sins? Thus there is no longer either good or evil; there is no person who acts, no first author of good and bad actions; noble deeds nor vile bear recompense or chastisement nor produce consequences. If someone were to slay thee, Nagasena, he would be innocent of murder? Is it thy hair, O master, that is Nagasena?"

"No, great king."

"Are the nails or the teeth, the skin or the flesh, or the bones, Nagasena?"

"No, great king."

"Then, master, are the name and body Nagasena?"

"No, great king."

"Is it that the sensations are Nagasena?"

"No, great king."

"Are the representations, the formations, the cognition, Nagasena?"

"No, great king."

"Well, then, master, the combination of the name and body, the sensat ons, representations, formations and cognition—is that Nagasena?"

"No, great king."

"Then, master, besides name and body, sensat ons, representations, formations and cognition, is there a Nagasena?"

"No, great king."

"So then, master, whatever way I go about it, I nowhere find Nagasena. An empty word—that is Nagasena. What then is Nagasena? Thou speakest falsely, O master, and thou liest; there is no Nagasena."

Nagasena then takes up the role of interlocutor.

"Didst thou come on foot or in chariot?"

"I never travel afoot, master. I am come in chariot."

"If thou art come in chariot, great king, explain me the chariot. Is it the pole, great king, that is the chariot?"

"No, the pole is not the chariot."

Nagasena turns to his own service the king's line of argument. He forces him to acknowle lge that the chariot is not the pole, nor the wheels, nor the seat, nor the yoke, nor the horses, nor the combination of all these parts, nor anything over and above them.

The Sthera (Dean) goes on triumphantly:

"So then, great king, whatever way I go about questioning thee, I nowhere fin l the chariot. An empty word, O king—that is the chariot. Thou speakest falsely, O king, and thou liest; there is no chariot. Thou art, great king, the sovereign of all India. What dost thou fear, that thou sayest what is not true? Let the five hundred Yavanas and the eighty thousand monks attend: here is king Milinda who says: "I am come in a chariot." And I say to him: 'If thou art

come in a chariot, then, explain me the chariot. But he cannot point out the chariot. Can this be allowed to pass?"

As he spoke thus, the five hundred Yavanas shouted approval for Nagasena and said to Milinda: "Now, great king, reply if thou canst."

Then said the king: "I do not say what is not true, reverend Nagasena. With reference to the pole, the axle, the wheels, the seat, we employ the name, the denomination, the designation, the expression, the word chariot."

"In sooth, great king, thou knowest well the chariot. In the same way, with reference to my hair, my skin and my bones, the name and body, sensations, representations, formations, and cognition, is used the name, the denomination, the designation, the expression, the word Nagasena—but a subject, in the narrow sense of the word, is not to be found here. The nun Vajira expressed it thus in presence of the Blessed One: 'Just as when the parts of the chariot are put together, we use the word chariot, so also where the five groups are found, there is the person—such is the common opinion.'"

"Wonderful, reverend sir! Prodigious! Many questions of all sorts came to my mind and thou hast solved them all. If Buddha were alive, he would approve, and would exclaim 'Good! Well done, Nagasena!'"

This dialogue is celebrated. It is always cited as showing clearly the Buddhistic view on the question of the soul. There is no substantial soul; it is but a name which indicates the aggregation, as the word chariot expresses the combination of the different parts of the vehicle. Neither *me* nor *thee*, but only two series of phenomena which are distinguished from each other by these two terms to which nothing real corresponds, beyond the phenomena themselves.

Since personal identity does not exist, what becomes of morality? How am I responsible for what I do, if the self who does the action is one series of phenomena, and the self, to which it is attributed is another series of phenomena? In spite of this, Buddha recognized responsibility for actions, but he does so only by virtue of a logical inconsequence from which he tries to escape by a subtility which must be branded as absurd. According to him we need not say: such a one has done such an act, and has experienced the consequences, nor such a one has done such an act and another has experienced the effects. The truth is between these two assertions. So that for Buddha two contradictory statements (not merely contraries) can be

false at the same time; the truth would rest in a half-way position which does not exist and cannot exist. Thus we see how a morality which in itself is the highest after Christianity has no metaphysical basis to rest upon.

To illustrate the fleeting nature of Being, the Buddhists use commonly the simile of a river whose waters flow without ceasing, or the flame of a lamp continuously burning. Oldenberg compares this doctrine unto that of Heraclitus, formulated in the memorable maxim: "All things flow." He could have quoted the dictum of Aristotle which includes the double image noted above: "The fire goes ever flowing like a river." For Heraclitus nothing is, all is becoming; all is dying, everything is changing; all becomes all, all is all; so that each thing contains in itself its own negation. This is the law of eternal becoming, the identity of contraries which Plato, Aristotle and the other atomists tried to reconcile with the philosophy of Parmenides who affirmed the unity and immutability of being. The intellect of Greece, especially as manifested in Heraclitus, Parmenides, Aristotle or Plato possesses far higher attributes than mere cleverness, and impresses itself with undeniable power. In the metaphysics of Buddhism sounding words, graceful images, but at bottom nothing... but intellectual Nirvana.

In the course of the dialogue between Nagasena and Milinda, the holy Buddhist, on the question of the identity of being in its different existences (or better perhaps the different phases of its existence), finally reaches this opinion: It is not the same being nor, on the other hand, different beings which succeed each other in the series of existences. This statement left the king dazed; he did not understand. We may acknowledge that in his place we would have understood as little and would have joined with him in demanding of Nagasena some explanation or example. Following is the example offered by the sage:

"It is just as if a man were to light a lamp; would not the lamp burn all through the night?"

"Yes, reverend sir, it would burn all the night.'

"Now, great king, would the flame during the first watch of the night be identical with the flame during the second watch of the night?'

"No, reverend sir."

"And would the flame during the second watch of the night be identical with the flame during the third watch of the night?"

"No, reverend sir."

"Well then, great king, is the light during the first watch one thing, while the light during the second part is another thing, and the light during the third part still another thing?"

"No, sir it has burned all the night by drawing from the same aliment."

"Thus also, great king, is closed the charm of the elements of being (Dhamma): one is born; the other passes away. Without beginning, without end, the circle closes; thus it is that there is not the same being nor a different being, that which is seized in the last place by the cognition."

Oldenberg remarks in a note, "the sense of these latter words is not perfectly clear." In so far as they can be understood they seem to me to mean that the self of which each one of us is conscious now is different without being different from the self of which we were conscious ten years ago. No doubt it is a kind of an antimony but it can be explained by a manner of speaking similar to what we use when we say: It is always the same Sarine, which flows by Fribourg, although the waters are renewed at each instant, and those which now flow past the town are not those which laved it an hour ago, perhaps not a drop the same.

In the same way we say that we have always the same body, although the elements which constitute it are being renewed incessantly so that to-day there does not remain a single atom of our body of ten years ago. It is the same body and it is not the same body. It is the same river and it is not the same river.

NIRVANA.

At the moment of his illumination, before beginning his missionary work, Buddha said: "It will be a difficult thing for humanity to grasp the law of causality, the chain of causes and effects. And another thing very difficult to grasp is the entrance into rest of all the formations, the detachment from the things of earth, the extinction of desire, the cessation of longing, the end, the Nirvana."

Oldenberg is of opinion that Nirvana is conceived as a sort of paradise, a dwelling-place of the elect Here as everywhere the Buddhistic thought is hard to catch and impossible to state in clear terms. It is always the same: Neither affirmation nor negation nor doubt, but a sort of mixture of all three elements.

When the texts speak of the Nirvana of this world, there is evidently question only of this state of indifference, of apathy, of in-

sensibility which is the foretaste of the final Nirvana. For example, Milinda thus expresses himself: "I do not sigh for death, I do not sigh for life; I wait for the hour to come, as a servant who waits for his recompense. I do not sigh for death, I do not sigh for life. I wait for the hour to come, conscious and with a watchful mind."

Nirvana, in this life, is a state of being without sin or sorrow, but, since the faithful is liable while living to fall once more under the domain of both of these, the true Nirvana is gained only after deliverance from life, i. e., from birth, decrepitude, and death. Once this deliverance comes: "Broken is the body, extinct the imagination, the sensations are all vanished, the formations cease, cognition exists no more."

But then what remains, and what in last analysis is Nirvana? Absolute nothingness, as many say? Or should we understand this word in the sense which it had in the Brahman system long ages before the appearance of Buddhism. This latter opinion is that of Max Mueller, whose soul rebelled at the notion that this doctrine which he so much admired should lead as its final word, to nothing. He said: "It would be no longer what every religion must be and wishes to be, a bridge thrown out between the finite and the infinite; it would be a deceptive plank which suddenly breaks, and, at the very moment when man thinks he has gained eternity, hurls him into the abyss of nothingness." (*Introduction to Buddhaghosha's Parable*, by Rogers, p.xxxix). Oldenberg comments on this passage: "In the stifling dream-peopled quiet of India, ideas arise and develop in different fashion from those which flourish in a Western atmosphere." Our mentality is not that of the Orientals: our mind, trained in a rigid discipline, cannot accommodate itself to the fancies or follies of the East.

For Buddhism, the universe with the collection of beings which form it is drawn into a circle of phenomena which appear only to disappear, and disappear only to re-appear. This is the wheel of Samsara. What sets this wheel spinning? at what period did its motion first begin? These are mysteries which Buddhism, conscious of its inability, has never attempted to explain. For it the conditioned exists, is a fact; ask it no more. The Satta, Atta (Sattvam, Atman) are terms which are met over and over again in its pages, but what is this Essence, this Soul, this Ego of which the Tathagata is the adequate form?

In the famous interview with Vacchagotta, who questioned him on the existence of the Ego, Buddha refused to answer. He justified himself to Anande by saying that if he had told the enquirer: The Ego exists, he would have concluded that the Brahmans were right in believing that the Atman and the world are imperishable; while if he had answered: The Ego does not exist, he could have inferred that those who admit annihilation are right. In either case, he would have led to error.

So Buddha refused to commit himself on this subject. If may be that he was afraid lest the blunt denial of the Ego, and the prospect of annihilation "towards which the premisses of the Buddhistic doctrine led directly" (Oldenberg), would be an obstacle to the spread of his teaching. At any rate that teaching seems to demand it in these views. Since existence is an evil, its radical suppression is the radical extirpation of this evil. Even if we suppose that the soul survives itself, so to speak, in a state of perfect felicity, there would be always grounds to fear that it might sometimes fall once more into the wheel of Samsara to begin a new circle of miseries. The only sure settlement of the difficulty would consist in its complete annihilation.

However this may be, when the Buddhist Church is asked whether the Perfect One lives or not after death, it has ready the response: "The Blessed Buddha has taught nothing on this point." Sakyamuni has therefore advanced a doctrine without providing for it a final sanction. In this regard at least, Brahmanism is of much greater value. It taught, indeed, the disappearance, or even the destruction of personality, but made the divine Essence the final resting-place of individual souls. Better lose consciousness of self in the Great All than in Nothingness. In refusing to be more definite about the nature of Nirvana, Buddha was honest, but he placed his doctrines on a manifestly lower plane of efficiency. Accordingly, the reaction came about, and Brahmanism drove from India the creed which had at one time expelled it from the valley of the Ganges. The countries which have become or remained Buddhist have accepted the premisses of Gautama without the conclusions which follow logically from them, and have settled in the affirmative the question whether there is a life beyond.

DUTIES TOWARDS OUR NEIGHBOR.

Buddhistic morality is found in the doctrine of the Dhamma, not in the discipline of the Vinaya.

We have already seen that the road which leads to deliverance has eight branches, known by the names pure faith, pure will, pure speech, pure action, pure means of existence, pure application, pure memory, pure meditation.

The Buddhists are fond of splitting up the faculties of the soul in an excessive way; they divide up the virtues and the vices and enclose them in set categories. They speak to you of the exact number of the virtues and the vices, of the fourfold effort forward, of the five faculties of the moral life and the five organs, of the five obstacles and the seven elements of illumination.

The whole morality of Buddhism consists in detachment from this world ,exactly like the morality of Brahmanism; for what is it in fact except the "indifference towards contraries" taught by the latter?

There are three categories which recur constantly: rightness (sila); samadhi or sitta, i. e., meditation, and finally wisdom, panna (pragna). These are the three stages in the voyage which leads to deliverance. One leads to another, but this idea must not be pushed too far, since all three must be pursued at the same time; and it is by following up rightness, meditation and wisdom together, that one arrives at the holiness required for Nirvana.

The moral life is above all a calculation, a balancing of receipts and expenses, of gains and losses. Following are the fine precepts which are a resumé of this morality; they are all negative: (1) Not to kill a living being; (2) Not to take the goods of one's neighbor; (3) Not to drink intoxicating liquors. The Bhikku was bound to absolute continence. Since the obligation of not doing evil generally includes that of doing good it resulted that these negative commands frequently became positive ones. Thus respect for animal life involved compassion or pity: that for truth forbade calumny; thus it excluded the element of discord and led to reconciliation between enemies, and the maintenance of concord and peace. Oldenberg denies strongly that the Buddhistic charity reaches the heights of evanglical charity. He says: "Buddhism commands not so much to love one's enemy, as not to hate him; it awakes benevolent and merciful tendencies towards the whole world, but without forgetting that to attach one's heart to other beings is to fall under the yoke of joys and consequently of sorrow in this transient world."

Here once more it is the spirit of detachment such as it has always been understood by the Brahman or, better perhaps, the Hindoo mind,

for it seems that this indifference is the result of the apathy and indolence of this race which dislikes the trouble of loving or hating. The difference is evident between this and Christian detachment. The story of Long-Sorrow and Long-Life gives us a sufficiently correct idea of the way in which Buddha recommended the pardon of wrongs.

King Long-Sorrow, driven from his kingdom by a powerful neighbor, Brahmadatta, took refuge with his wife secretly in the capital of his conqueror. There was born to him a son whom he called Long-Life. Brahmadatta, however, learning of his presence, had him and his wife seized and put to death. While they were leading him to execution the father said to his son: "Look not too far nor too near; it is not by enmity that enmity is appeased, but rather by the absence of enmity." Brahmadatta made the young Long-Life his favorite. One day he fell asleep after the chase in a remote corner of the forest his head resting on the knees of his young page. They were alone. Long-Life was now master of the fate of Brahmadatta, the murderer of his father. Thrice he raised his sword to smite him, and thrice the recollection of the last advice of his father overcame him. Brahmadatta awakening perceived him with his sword in his hand. He begged his life. Long-Life asked of him the same mercy. The reconciliation was made and both swore eternal friendship. Brahmadatta gave back to Long-Life the kingdom and the treasures which he had taken from his father, and gave him his daughter in marriage.

This legend, which is attributed to Buddha, is related to show that the pardon of injuries is a method that pays well. Long-Life, recalling the words of his father explains them thus to Brahmadatta: "Thou hast, O king, put my father and my mother to death. If now, O king, I wished to take thy life then those who were attached to thee would take my life, and those who were attached to me would take their lives, and so our enmity would not be appeased by enmity. But now, O king, thou hast granted me the favor of life, thus by the absence of enmity our enmity is appeased. This is what my father meant to say."

The story of Kounala is more touching because, apparently at least, it is more disinterested. It is the story of a young and handsome prince with marvelously beautiful eyes. One of his step-mothers fell in love with him and made advances which he repulsed with horror. The furious woman stole the royal seal and counterfeited an order to pluck out the prince's eyes. When he received this command, sealed with the royal seal, he had his eyes plucked out. When the king knew

what had taken place he ordered in his wrath that the guilty woman be put to death. Kounala appeased his father's anger and protested that he forgave the queen with his whole heart. He added: "As sure as these words are the truth may my eyes return to me as they were." And his eyes, says the legend, returned as beautiful as before.

The Buddhists are recommended to take from time to time certain set postures which are supposed to help them to enter into communication with the universe. The Sublime One has indicated the way to do this: "After the meal, on returning from the quest I go to the forest. I heap up the leaves and herbs I find there and on the pile I seat myself, my legs crossed, my body upright, and my countenance veiled n wakeful thought. Thus I remain wh le I let the force of the benevolence of which my thought is full extend itself over one of the quarters of the world, and then over the second, the third, the fourth, above, below, and through; in every sense, in all fulness, over the whole universe I allow the force of the benevolence of which my thought is full to spread out from me, vast, grand, inexhaustible, knowing no hate, aiming at no hurt."

There is established between the person thus meditating and the object of this meditation an attraction which the latter cannot resist. Thus the elephant Nalagiri, set charging at Buddha by Devadatta, stops short before the force of the benevolence radiating from him. So too Roja, the Malla, who had before been hostile, went of his own accord to seek the Perfect One, through this same power of attraction.

The weak points in the Buddhistic scheme of benevolence are that in inculcating it too much stress is laid on the fact that it pays to be generous; and further, as Oldenberg says: "It is not the poor who are put forward as the objects of charity, but religious, monks, the sage."

DUTIES TOWARDS SELF.

For Buddhism, as for Christianity, self-perfection is the paramount duty. "Step by step, bit by bit, hour by hour, the wise man should purify his being of all alloy, as a goldsmith purifies his gold." The first duties of every man are control of the senses, watchfulness, and contentment.

Meditation often means merely an absolute blankness of mind, a sort of Nirvana of thought. Methods are given for reaching this condition by concentrating the attention on the mere fact of breathing, etc. On account of the stupefying efforts of such a system, it is vain

to expect of Buddhism truly philosophical thinking or elevated concepts. Its finest and noblest ideas and images it has borrowed from other systems.

The long hours which the Buddhist ascetic, monk, or nun, passed in absolute rigidity, thinking of nothing for fear of thinking of evil, developed pathological nerve conditions. These, especially among the women, produced strange hallucinations. And on this account the Buddhistic writings are full of stories of visions and apparitions somewhat like the legendaries of Christendom. The Buddhists also knew of the extatic state (Jhana) and in order to attain it, made use of set methods which Oldenberg calls auto-hypnotism, or, as the phrase is now, auto-suggestion.

One exercise consists in gradually freeing the mind from all that is not the self, and consequently from all that could be an obstacle to the deliverance. These meditations are not on the vanity of the things of this world, or the nothingness of all that is not God, as is frequent in Christian meditations. They are on nothingness itself, on the non-existences of all things.

It will not be out of place to indicate here other differences between Buddhism and Christianity. The latter claims as its founder God Himself. Buddhism, on the contrary, makes no attempt to prove its origin from God, with whose existence or nature it does not concern itself. It does not need the word even of Buddha, or, to speak more exactly, of Siddhartha, i. e., of one man more than another. This indeed was Buddha's own opinion. He considered himself as a man greater than other men because he was better instructed and had taught them the way of Deliverance. He compared himself to a chicken that with beak and claws makes his way out of the shell before the rest of his mates. He is the firstborn of the brood—that is all. Every chicken that breaks from the shell is delivered in its turn, and, though later in time, by the same title as the first comer. We Christians are delivered by Christ, who is for us the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Budda saves no one; he shows the way, he teaches the truth, he indicates the life. But there his work stops; it is for each man by his own strength to reach the end thus manifested.

The Christ appears once and for all times. The universal Buddhas appear from epoch to epoch. The work of each disappears entirely in the course of time, and then a new Buddha comes on earth to resume the task of his predecessor. There is just one Buddha more to come—Metteya (Maitreya). Oldenberg remarks that of all

the universal Buddhas of whose names we have the list. Siddhartha alone has a historical character; they are creations of the imagination like the Buddha that is to come.

MARA, THE EVIL ONE.

The origin of evil was not revealed by the master, and accordingly Buddhism forbids enquiry into it. It does not look upon Mara as the author of evil, any more than it considers the Buddha as the author of good, but it views them as being the one the highest expression of the evil, and the other the highest expression of the good, and therefore as being two irreconcilable adversaries.

For the common people Mara was a living being with a personal existence like Buddha; but the initiated are well aware that the term indicates the evil tendencies of nature, the travail of death (mara) which never ceases day or night and which produces everything defective or perishable in the world. All ills, all misfortunes are attributed to Mara. So too all thoughts of pride, sensuality, etc., are imputed to him. To escape his attacks one must watch without ceasing over the senses and take care to give no hold to the enemy. The favorite analogy is that of a tortoise which defeats the attack of its enemy by keeping close in its shell.

Mara is the personification of all the vices, of all imperfections and disturbances, physical or moral. The Buddhist must fight against it in its manifold forms. And in doing so he must rely on his own powers, since gods as well as men belong to a world of mixed good and evil, and have enough to do in looking after their own welfare without troubling themselves with the affairs of others. Or if by any chance there may exist somewhere a being over whom Mara has no hold, the Buddhist does not know of him and does not reckon on his assistance. Thus at bottom the religion of Buddha is not a religion, but a philosophy.

A Roussel.

Fribourg, Switzerland.

TO WHOM WAS THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS ADDRESSED?

F. Hugh Pope, O. P.

Many will regard this as one of the questions which ought to be relegated to the limbo of dead controversies, but sometimes controversies long buried assume a new importance as our knowledge grows. The Epistle to the Ephesians and that to the Colossians are sister epistles. Both were conveyed to their destination by Tychicus, both were written at the same time, and also from Rome. The doctrines handled are very much the same; the master words *εκκλησια, πληρωμα, σωμα, κεφαλη, μυστηριον*, etc., are the same; the words, *συνζωοποιεω, συνεγειρω, απαλλοτριοω, αποκαταλασσω, αφη ανθρωπαρεσκος*, etc., are only found in them, and the two epistles are rightly regarded as complementary one to the other; the one treats of the Church, the Body of Christ, the other of Christ, the Head of His Body, the Church. It used to be the fashion to regard one of these epistles—critics were never decided which one—as a servile imitation of the other, but those days are past. But the most striking feature about the epistle to the Ephesians is its impersonal character. Tychicus, the bearer, is mentioned (vi, 21, 22,) and in almost exactly the same terms as in Col. iv, 7, 8, but here the personal element ends. We find none of those affectionate salutations which occur in the sister-epistle to the Colossians, and which are so marked a feature of the epistle to the Romans. This fact so impressed Renan that he transferred to the Ephesian epistle all the salutations to disciples at Rome which occur in Romans xvi. This was a drastic procedure, and his view is generally rejected nowadays.[1] We must bear in mind, however, that the Marcionite canon gave Romans without the last two chapters.

At the same time Renan's premise remains true, viz., that in our epistle we do not find those salutations which we should naturally expect. Nor is it St. Paul alone who fails to send salutations. When writing at the very same time to the Colossians, he says: "Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner, saluteth you." Now this Aristarchus was with St. Paul during the riot (Acts xix, 29; cf. xx, 4; xxvii, 2). How is

[1]Cf. Lightfoot, "Philippians," p. 171; Sanday and Headlam, "Romans," p. xciii; Jacquier, "History of the Books N. T.," Engl. transl., vol. i. 197-199.

it, then, that he sends no salutation to the Ephesians? And in the same Colossian letter we notice how careful St. Paul is to send messages from among those among his companions, who came from Colossæ: he mentions "Onesimus, who is one of you;" and again, he says: "Epaphras saluteth you, who is one of you."

Nor can we fit our epistle into Acts xviii-xx as we should expect. How strange that there is not in the epistle the faintest allusion to John's baptism, the school of Tyrannus, the exorcists, the magical practices, nor even to the temple of Diana or the riot! Some[2] have indeed attempted to trace an agreement between the epistle and St. Paul's address at Miletus (Acts xx), but we fear the list of resemblances will not bear strict examination. We need hardly refer to the passages where St. Paul seems to expressly declare that he does not know the members of the Church he is addressing; i, 5; iii, 2; iv, 20-21. The whole epistle reads like a letter of exhortation to people of whose recent conversion the apostle has just heard, thus compare i, 13, 15, 16, 18; ii, 1-2; ii, 11, 12, 19-22; iii, 2-4; iv, 7, 20-32; indeed, the same must be said of the whole of the hortatory part of the epistle. There is nowhere a single personal note struck, no allusion to his ever having been among them, no hint that he has ever seen them or taught them; they are raw converts who need clear dogmatic teaching about the Church, and the mystery of Gentile reception into it. His relation towards them is almost exactly that which subsisted between himself and the Roman Church, when he wrote to them from Corinth in 57, and it is interesting to note the similarity of tone between this Ephesian epistle and the first and the fifteenth chapters of the epistle to the Romans. Hence scholars have long discussed the destination of our Ephesian epistle.[3] The words *εν Εφεσω* in i, 2, are possibly spurious.[4] Origen[5] would seem not to have had them, and St. Basil[6] appears to omit them, his words on the opening sentence of the epistle are clearly an echo of what Origen had said; Tertullian[7] does not appeal to them when refuting Marcion's declaration that the epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans; and

[2]Moule, Cambridge Bible for Schools. Ephesians, p. 32.

[3]For a list of early discussions, cf. Wolfe, *Curæ Philologicæ in N. T.*, vol. iv, Basle 1741.

[4]Cf. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 377-396. W. and H. *New Testament*, t.ii, 123-4. Jacquier, *History of Books*, N. T., Engl. tr., vol. i, 250, where, however, the Patristic evidence is overstated.

[5]In Cramer's *Catena*, vi, 102. Charteris' *Canonicity*, 241, and Lightfoot, *l. c.*

[6]*Adv. Eunom.*, lib. ii.

[7]*Adv. Marcionem*, v, 11 and 17.

St. Jerome's[8] words leave us in doubt as to what text he had. The words are also omitted in B. and in the cursive Ms: 67.[9]

We have, then, the following data: Marcion called our epistle that to the Laodiceans, Origen and St. Basil seem to have found in the oldest Mss. no name of any addresses, while at the same time they knew that tradition assigned it to the Ephesians. These are facts; what are we to deduce from them? Two main views have been held: (a) that our epistle to the Ephesians was really addressed to the Laodiceans; (b) that it was a circular letter with a blank space left by the apostle so that the name of the particular church to which it was thought convenient to send it might be inserted. This latter view is that commonly held nowadays,[10] and we will, therefore, examine it first. It originated with Ussher *Annales ad lxiv*, p. 686, and was also warmly advocated by Julian Garnier, O. S. B. (1722), the editor of St. Basil's works. Garnerius thought that we could thus explain Marcion's assignation of the epistle to the Laodiceans, and also the fact that the epistle was later universally assigned to the Ephesians. He thought that being a circular letter, and thus possessing no distinctive name, it was conveniently named after the metropolitan church of Asia, viz., Ephesus. Under this title the epistle gradually became better known, and so came to be called the epistle to the Ephesians, as though addressed to them alone.[11] There is something peculiarly attractive about this view. We seem to be in presence of a concrete instance of a textual corruption, the growth of which we can trace. Thus Origen would seem to have never heard of any Mss. in which the words *εν Εφεσω* occurred, while by the time of St. Basil they had crept into the later Mss., but were not in the more ancient ones. Moreover, Col. iv, 15-16, "Salute the brethren, who are at Laodicea; and Nymphas, and the church in his house. And when this epistle shall have been read with you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that you read that which is of the Laodiceans (*την εκ Λαοδικειας*)", may be adduced in support of this view, for many maintain that this "letter to the Laodiceans" is our epistle to the Ephesians, only with the insertion "at Laodicea" in place of "at Ephesus" in the opening clause.

[8] *Comment in Ep. ad Ephes.*

[9] W. and H. l. c.

[10] Cf. Lightfoot, l. c. "Colossians," p. 37.

[11] This view is held by many Catholic writers, e. g., Hug, Lamy, Bisping, Duchesne, Fouard, Belser, etc. Cf. Jacquier, *l. c.*, 207.

It seems to us, however, that there are grave difficulties in this view, and that its very simplicity makes it suspect. If the epistle to the Ephesians was a circular one, why did St. Paul think it needful to write to the Colossians at the same time? The two epistles are supplementary to one another; if one is a circular, so also ought the other to have been; yet there is no trace of this in the letter to the Colossians. Again, Tychicus was the bearer of both letters; are we to suppose that he went from church to church carrying the epistle we now know as Ephesians? Is it not far more probable that such a letter would be taken to one church, and then sent on by them to their neighbors? Col. iv, 16, certainly supports this. And, again, will the circular view avoid the difficulty about the want of salutations? Can we imagine that the Ephesians would be satisfied with a merely circular letter? Would they be content to be put on a par with churches which had never seen Paul? We think, indeed, that those who hold the view that our epistle is an encyclical letter, can hardly have studied the opening clauses of St. Paul's epistles. In the epistle to the Galatians we have an undoubted example of an encyclical letter, one which had to be read in Antioch of Pisidia, in Lystra, Derbe, and Iconium, and this is clearly but simply indicated in the opening words: *Παυλος ...ταις εκκλησιαις της Γαλατιας.* Note, too, the opening words of of the two Corinthian epistles. Corinth was a metropolitan city, and St. Paul meant his letter to reach the dependent churches as well; yet he does not express this by leaving a blank to be filled in as convenient; on the contrary, I Cor. i, 2, reads: "...unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus ...called to be saints with all that invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ;" and even more especially in the second epistle:..."to the church of God that is at Corinth, with all the saints that are in all Achaia." Contrast with these careful expressions the opening words to the Ephesians: "Paul...to the saints who are (at Ephesus), and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." We put the words "at Ephesus" in brackets because it is plain that some church, whether Ephesus or Laodicea, must have been addressed. When we turn to the Colossian Epistle we find almost exactly the same phrasing: "Paul...to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ Jesus, who are at Colossæ."

Indeed, excluding the pastoral epistles, we are inclined to rank among the essentially non-circular letters those addressed to the Romans and Thessalonians, Philippians, Ephesians and Colossians, and

this precisely because here alone St. Paul does not use a formula which he elsewhere uses when writing an encyclical letter.

As already stated, then, the question of the relationship of these two epistles has been repeatedly discussed, and various conclusions have been arrived at. But critics have hitherto been hampered by the want of geographical knowledge of Asia Minor. Strabo gives an abundance of detail, but what students needed was personal modern investigation. This need has been abundantly supplied by Professor (now Sir) W. M. Ramsay, and to him and to other scientific explorers, such as Sterrett, Smith, Brown, Hogarth and Headlam, all students of St. Paul's epistles and of the Acts of the Apostles, indeed of all Ante-Nicene history, owe an immense debt of gratitude. The maps alone in Ramsay's, e. g., *The Church and the Roman Empire*; *Historical Commentary on the Galatians*; *Cities and Bishoprics of Asia Minor*, and above all, in his *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, are worth the cost of the volumes in which they are found.[12]

A traveller, then, in St. Paul's time who wished to go from, let us say Athens, to any station on the Euphrates, would have landed at Ephesus after voyaging some three miles up the river Cayster, on which that city stood. He would then have had a choice of two roads, the one on his left, which St. Paul himself took when (Acts xix, 1,) he went from Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus, passed through Tralla, Dionysopolis, and Metropolis, where it joins the road which was on the traveller's right when he stood at the eastern gate of Ephesus.[13] This lower road is the one with which we are here concerned. It follows the River Meander up to the junction of that river with the River Lycus. Here the traveller passes through what may be termed the "open gate of Phrygia," and finds himself in a land of streams and rugged mountains, of boiling mud-springs and geysers. He is in the valley of the Lycus and nearly one hundred miles from Ephesus by now. The land is rich in spite of its rugged character, and all around he sees traces of a civilization and of a dense population, both of which have long since passed away. On his left as he journeys up the valley he sees the glistening ruins of Hierapolis; right opposite to it on his right are the remains of Laodicea,[14] while further up the valley in a glen apart lies Colossea. These three towns form a somewhat

[12]We cannot understand how an able critic like Ladenze can assign the epistle to the Ephesians to the Euxine Pontus, Rev. Biblique. Oct., 1902. p. 573-581.

[13]Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Asia Minor*. 219-221.

[14]*Ibid.*, p. 3-4., and Lightfoot, *Colossians*, the chapter devoted to the" Churches of the Lycus." pp. 1-70.

flattened triangle, of which Laodicea to the southwest is the apex. It lies about six miles from Hierapolis and about ten from Colossæ, which is itself only about fifteen miles from Hierapolis. These cities had been founded by Greek kings, but they acquired their real importance under the road-making Romans. The "Eastern Highway" was "a thoroughfare," says Ramsay, "which might rank among the most important in the whole empire, and this valley was one of the four most important points on the Highway, along with Ephesus, and Cæsarea-Mazaka."[15] The same writer points out a little further on that "at Laodiceia the Eastern Highway meets four other roads: (1) Northwest, the important road from Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelpheia, etc.; (2) Southeast, continuous with the last is an equally important road from Pamphylia, Pisidia, Cibyra, etc.; (3) Northeast, the road from Dorylaion, the Pentapolis, Eumeneia, and Lounda; (4) North, the road from Dionysopolis, Mossyna, and Motella. Laodiceia was thus marked out as an administrative center; and it was the meeting-place of the Cibyralic *conventus* from an early time."[16] The term "conventus" needs explanation.[17]

In the year 84 B. C., Sulla incorporated most of Phrygia in the province of Asia, and he it was who arranged the various "conventus," as they were called.[18] These were assemblages of towns very similar to our counties. The principal ones seem to have been those of Sardis, Ephesus, Alabanda, Synuada, Apamæa, and Cibyra.[19] The Cibyratic "conventus" embraced some twenty-three towns of Southwest Phrygia, amongst them being Hierapolis, Colossæ, and Laodicea;[20] its western frontier was drawn between Laodicea and Tripolis,[21] which lay near the mouth of the Lycus valley. Cibyra, which gave its name to the "conventus," lay off the main road, and considerably to the south. It soon lost its importance and the "conventus" of Cibyra is often termed that of Laodicea.[22] This latter city was one of the richest in Asia, and had become, owing to its central position, a great center of trade and financial transactions. Cicero intended to cash there

[15] *Ibid.*, 11.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 12., note.
[17] Cf. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 7.
[18] Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, p. 265.
[19] *Ibid.*, 173.
[20] *Ibid.*, 341.
[21] *Ibid.*, 193.
[22] *Ibid.*, 53, 266.

his bills of exchange (*Ad Fam. iii*, 5.)[23] and St. John's words (Apoc. iii, 7,) to the church at Laodicea are peculiarly apt: "I am rich and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing." It was also famous for its peculiarly glossy black wool, a fact which gives point to other words of St. John in his letter to the church at Laodicea: "I counsel thee to buy of me *white* garments, that thou mayest clothe thyself." (Apoc, iii, 18).[24]

We must, then, regard the churches of the Lycus valley as constituting a homogeneous whole. They were all in Phrygia;[25] their members spoke the same tongue;[26] the towns Hierapolis, Laodicea, and Colossæ, belonged to the same "conventus," or county; they were under the same administrative government; they were in turn chosen as places where the assizes could be held;[27] they were united by the closest bonds of fellowship and mutual protection; and they derived the greater part of their wealth and importance from their position on the great highway between East and West. Laodicea, if not the metropolis, was certainly the most important of them all, and actually gave its name to the "conventus," of which Cibyra was really the head. It is noteworthy, too, that it alone of these Phrygian towns, is addressed directly by St. John in the Apocalypse. Moreover, and this fact has considerable bearing upon the conclusion we hope to arrive at, these towns had nothing to do with Ephesus; they were at least one hundred miles inland from that great city, and though of course they depended on it as the market for their trade and as the goal of the great road which passed through their midst, they were not, as far as can be discovered, in any way subject to its government. Again, the religious attitude of Ephesus and that of the Lycus valley were essentially different. The inhabitants of Ephesus were Lydians; they were thoroughly Grecian; they worshipped Diana, or, rather, her Asiatic counterpart, Cybele; they were greedy of gain and indifferent to the various new beliefs then constantly put forward; indeed, they seem to have paid no attention to St. Paul's preaching till they found it was endangering their pockets;[28] whereas the dwellers in the Lycus valley were, at least fundamentally, Phrygians, though

[23] *Ibid.*, 39; and Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 43.

[24] *Ibid.*, 42, and Mommsen, *Provinces*, i, 360.

[25] Lightfoot, *Colossians*, 17.

[26] Mommsen, *Provinces*, vol. i, 328-332.

[27] For we may probably apply to them the words which Dio Crysostom used to the people of Apameia, cf. Ramsay, *l. c.* 428-429.

[28] Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, 131.

Hierapolis seems to have belonged to Lydia. The male element was prominent in their worship, just as the female predominated in that of the effeminate Lydians and Ephesians. The Lycus valley was indeed a meeting ground for many many various classes, as Ramsay has said: "We have all three races (the Lydian, Carian, and Phrygian) united in the Lydian Hierapolis, the Phrygian Colossai, and the Carian Attonda and Trapezopolis, while Laodiceia and Tripolis are the Græco-Roman cities founded and maintained by a later incursion of the western spirit into this debatable ground between oriental and European races."[29]

To return once more to the two epistles we have been discussing. We have already dwelt upon their remarkable similarity, but have also pointed out the differences between them. The one was controversial, the other dogmatic and moral; the one was personal, the other impersonal; the one full of life and vigor, the other more like a formal treatise. But the tendency is, we think, to exaggerate these differences. It is true that in the Ephesian epistle no definite point is attacked while in that to Colossæ the writer shows that he has heard of definite abuses amongst the members of that church, and has been told that a false system of angelology and a vain philosophy have crept into their midst. But it is not true to say that these things are entirely absent from the Ephesian epistle. They are not attacked in that letter, but they are hinted at, and this we feel is due to the fact that the two churches to which the epistles were severally sent, were near neighbors, and that though the apostle had not heard that the same faults were rife in both, he did not doubt but that the poison which had infected the one would quickly infect the other, if indeed it had not done so already. Thus we regard our epistle to the Ephesians as an afterthought arising from the apostle's fear for the church at Laodicea. This will perhaps explain why the angelology of Col. i, 13, 16; ii, 18, finds its parallel in Ephes. i, 21; iii, 10, and why the doctrine *de coelestibus*, Col. ii, 15, accords with that in Ephes. i, 20; ii, 6; iii, 10, and the "vain philosophy" of Col. ii, 8, with Ephes. iv, 14. The closeness of the union between the churches of the Lycus valley is apparent from Col. iv, 13. "He (Epaphras) hath much laboured for you (the Colossians) and for them that are at Laodicea, and for them at Hierapolis," and we have already referred to the interchange of letters between Colossæ and Laodicea. Now if our epistle to the Ephesians had borne, as Marcion said, the title "to the Laodiceans,"

[29] *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 9.

we are confident that every commentator would have dwelt upon the harmony subsisting between it and the epistle to the Colossians, and would, when discussing the authenticity of the former, have appealed unhesitatingly to Col. iv, 16. It is true that it is the fashion to insist upon the force of the preposition in the expression "the letter *of* the Laodiceans" and to maintain that this confirms the view that the letter was never written *to* the Laodiceans themselves, but was merely an encyclical which had reached them at that time, and which they had been instructed to hand on to the church at Colossæ.

But when we compare once more the epistle to the Ephesians with that to the Colossians, we feel that this view is untenable. The two latter supplement each other. The one treats of the Church, the other of the Head of the Church; the epistle to the Colossians attacks the faults to which they were addicted; that to the Ephesians hints at the same faults, and thus warns the recipients of the epistle against falling into them. If it were not that the "encyclical" theory demanded support we much question whether any critic would have read into the words "*of* the Laodiceans," the meaning suggested above. The straightforward interpretation of the passage is surely that just as St. Paul had written to the Colossians, so he had at the same time written to the Laodiceans and had despatched his two letters by the same bearer, Tychicus. The two letters are much akin and supplement one another, hence St. Paul urges that the two churches should communicate their letters one to the other. The Laodiceans will be glad to receive *from* the Colossians the letter which the latter have received, and similarly the Colossians will receive *from* the Laodiceans the letter St. Paul has written to them.

We venture to put forward once more, then, the view which has often been upheld, viz., that the epistle we now know as that to the Ephesians is really that to the Laodiceans.[30] As already pointed out, Marcion held the same, and we need not suppose that his doctrinal presuppositions contributed to this view. He seems to have stated it as an historical fact. Grotius, Erasmus, Vitringa, Archbishop Wake, and Mill in his *Prolegomena ad N. T.* ff. 71 and 109, held the same. Perhaps we shall be told that we are not in very good company, but a critical question cannot be decided by the reputations of those who hold this or that view: it must be determined by the evidence which can be adduced on either side. The question was much debated amongst the Continental Reformers, and in 1712, T. Quendt pub-

[30] As we write, this view is again put forward in the *Expository Times*, April, 1908.

lished a dissertation entitled "Utrum Epistola ad Ephesios a Paulo Ephesüs an Laodicenis inscripta sit?" He decided in favor of the Ephesians.[31]

But if our epistle is really not that addressed to the Ephesians two questions at once demand an answer: (a) How comes it that the epistle was always known as that to the Ephesians? (b) What has become of the actual epistle written by St. Paul to the Ephesians —if indeed such an epistle ever was written? An ingenious answer to the first question was offered by Wall *Notæ Criticæ in N. T.* ff. 280-283.[32] This scholar suggested that Tychicus, the bearer of the epistle to the Laodiceans and the Colossians, being himself a native of Ephesus (Acts xx, 4), was anxious that his native church of Ephesus should have the advantage of seeing the epistle to the Laodiceans; he perhaps made a copy of it and gave it to the church at Laodicea, but sent the autograph to Ephesus. This gave rise to the general acceptance of the epistle as being really addressed to the Ephesians! Wall further suggested that this would explain the fact that the Christians of Pontus, e. g., Marcion and St. Basil, had not the words *ἐν Ἐφεσῳ* in their Mss. We doubt whether such an explanation will find favor, and we must confess that it is easier to ask how the epistle to the Laodiceans came to be called that to the Ephesians than to give any satisfactory answer.

The second question, whether there ever was any epistle to the Ephesians properly so-called, and if so, what has become of it? is also exceedingly difficult to answer. We have seen that Marcion, according to Tertullian, called our epistle to the Ephesians the epistle to the Laodiceans, and though the arguments we have so far adduced are by no means conclusive, they yet seem to afford good grounds for thinking that Marcion was not wrong in so designating the epistle. But unfortunately our knowledge of what Marcion actually said is very slight, and moreover is solely derived from those who undertook to refute his general position and who have nowhere, apparently, given us his exact words. Indeed, the whole question of Marcion's canon is a very vexed one. According to Tertullian[33] he rejected the Pastoral epistles entirely: "I wonder," writes Tertullian, "that when he received the epistle to Philemon, which was only written to an individual, he did not see his way to receive the two epistles to

[31]Cf. Wolfe, *Curæ Philologicæ*, vol. iv, p. 3. Basle, 1741.
[32]Quoted by Wolfe, *l. c.*, p. 2.
[33]*Adv. Marc.*, v. 21.

Timothy and the one to Titus." St. Epiphanius[34] agrees with that when he says that Marcion's *Apostolicon* contained Galatians, I and II Corinthians, Romans, I and II Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians, and certain portions of the epistles to the Laodiceans. Further on,[35] however, he describes Marcion's *Apostolicon* as a hotch-potch, made up of mutilated fragments from Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, Laodiceans, Galatians, I and II Corinthians, I and II Thessalonians, Philemon, Philippians, *I and II Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews*![36] But what is most interesting to us at the present juncture is the fact that in both his lists we find the epistle to the Ephesians *as well as that to the Laodiceans*. It is hard to make this statement agree with Tertullian's explicit words. Yet we have no right to reject St. Epiphanius' testimony, as so many are ready to do, for he tells us at what pains he has been to study Marcion's works so as to weave out of the quotations of books cited by him, and allowed by him to be canonical, an ample refutation of the heresiarch's principal doctrines. When we turn to this portion of St. Epiphanius' treatise on the Marcionite heresy, we find an even greater confusion for he gives three quotations from Marcion which, according to Epiphanius, the heresiarch definitely declares to be taken from the epistle to the Ephesians;[37] and these passages agree with our present epistle, viz., Ephes. ii, 11-13, (*l. c.* 371.) v, 14, (*l. c.* 372), and v, 31, (*l. c.* 372). Marcion, then, clearly knew our epistle to the Ephesians and cited it as such! Nor is this all. St. Epiphanius concludes his refutation of Marcion's doctrines out of the heretic's own *Apostolicon* by saying: "Marcion added also to his own so-called *Apostolicon* portions from the so-called epistle to the Laodiceans," and he quotes at once "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, *one Christ*, one God and Father of all." This agrees verbatim (excepting the words "one Christ" with our present epistle to the Ephesians, iv, 5-6, as St. Epiphanius is not slow to point out: "This accords with the epistle to the Ephesians, Marcion, and these testimonies against yourself, which

---

[34]*Hær.*, xlii. (Greek) (Migne, No. 310).

[35]*Ibid.*, xlii, No. 321.

[36]The passage is almost certainly corrupt, for not only is Epiphanius quite alone in this statement, but he contradicts what he had said a few paragraphs higher up, and as has been pointed out to me, contradicts himself in the very passage under discussion, for he says: ..... and then proceeds to quote *all the fourteen* epistles with the addition of that to the Laodiceans!

[37]*Hær*, xlii. Nos. 310-11. (Migne).

you have collected from the so-called epistle to the Laodiceans bear witness against yourself.[38] He then points out that Marcion, in adding these testimonies from the epistle to the Laodiceans, was adding to the *Apostolicon*: "The wretched Marcion instead of citing this testimony from the epistle to the Ephesians, takes it from that to the Laodiceans, which was never in the *Apostolicon*."[39]

It is noteworthy that St. Epiphanius never denies the existence of this Laodicean epistle, and he seems to tacitly allow that it was very similar to our epistle to the Ephesians when he thus blames Marcion for preferring to quote a passage from the epistle to the Laodiceans, when he could equally well have taken it from the canonical epistle

It is futile to suggest as has been done that St. Epiphanius was mistaken in supposing that there were two distinct epistles, one to the Ephesians, and one to the Laodiceans. The latter is expressly mentioned by St. Philastrius, *Hær.* 88, and St. Jerome says: "Legunt quidam et ad Laodicenses, sed ab omnibus exploditur." *De Viris Illustr.* v. The actual text of such a letter will be found in Lightfoot *Colossians*, and the Latin text—the only one existing—in Giles *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, p. 511-512. But it does not contain the passage from Ephesians iv, which, as we have already seen, was quoted by St. Epiphanius as being taken from what Marcion termed the epistle to the Laodiceans, and it consequently cannot be the epistle to the Laodiceans, known to St. Epiphanius and to Marcion.

Here we must leave the question as we have no data at our disposal, which would enable us to decide what Marcion, or even what St. Epiphanius himself, held regarding the epistle to the Laodiceans. We might, however, suggest that since Marcion lived about 150 A. D.,[40] and St. Epiphanius about 380, we may rather trust Tertullian's statements about the heresiarch's tenets than those of St. Epiphanius, for Tertullian died less than one hundred years after Marcion. At the same time it might be retorted that St. Epiphanius has left us a careful treatise on Marcion's doctrines, and must have been well acquainted with Tertullian's work on the same subject. If he contradicted Tertullian he did so with his eyes open.

In January, 1907, Dom de Bruyne contributed to the *Revue Benedictine* a most interesting paper, entitled "Prologues bibliques

[38] *L. c.*, 374.
[39] *L. c.*, 375.
[40] Irenæus. *Hær*, iii, 3, and iii, 12.

d'origine Marcionite." We wish we could transcribe the whole article, but in justice to the author we can only indicate its main conclusions. In most Mss. of the Vulgate we find prefixed to each epistle "argumenta," similar in character to the brief prefaces often printed in our Douay version. Dom de Bruyne has shown, (a) that in the Old Latin Mss. from which these "augumenta" were derived, the order of the epistles must have been that of Marcion as given above, except that Philemon should come last; (b) that the epistles to which the original "argumenta" were prefixed were the ten which Marcion received and no others; and (c) that Ephesians was known as Laodiceans. Thus in *Codex Amiatinus* we find that the "argumentum" to Colossians runs as follows: "Colossenses et hi sicut Laodicenses sunt Asiani: et ipsi praeventi erant a pseu lo apostolis...." As the "argumenta" are closely connected, the phrasing of that to the Colossians seems to indicate that an epistle to the Laodiceans had preceded, else the writer could not say "et hi sicut Laodicenses." If we now turn to the "argumentum," prefixed to the epistle to the Ephesians, we find: "Ephesi sunt Asiani. Hi accepto verbo veritatis persteterunt in fide. Hos conlaudat apostolus, scribens eis a Roma de carcere per Tychicum diaconum." Now not only is this "augumentum" cast in a very different mould from most of the others, but it is a servile copy of that prefixed to the Philippian epistle. Hence Dom de Bruyne argues that this "argumentum" is not one of the original ones, but has been substituted for an older one. Again, that the epistle to which the title "Laodiceans" with corresponding "argumentum" was prefixed was our epistle to the Ephesians, and not the apocryphal and colorless epistle to the Laodiceans we know, is proved (a) by the fact that the original author of these "argumenta" had not the epistle to the Hebrews in his canon, as Dom de Bruyne shows; but the combination involved in the omission of Hebrews and retention of Laodiceans cannnot date later than 350 A. D.; (b) those Mss. which contain the apocryphal "Laodiceans" do not place it before Colossians, as we have seen was the case here, but right at the end of the "corpus Paulinum;" (c) wherever the apocryphal "Laodiceans" is given, it wants the appropriate "argumentum," though Dom de Bruyne did find later such an "argumentum" prefixed to a ninth century Mss. of the apocryphal "Laodiceans," but it was evidently spurious.

As to the real nature of what we may venture to term the lost epistle to the Ephesians, we have a statement of St. Ignatius of Antioch which may possibly enlighten us. St. Ignatius writes to the Ephesians

(ch. xii) and eulogises them as "men initiated with St. Paul into the mysteries." He then adds that he hopes that he himself will follow in the footsteps of the same Paul, ος εν παση επιστολη μνημονευει υμων. Many have thought that in the expression Παυλου συμμυσται, there was a reference to the "mysterium," which forms so prominent a feature in the epistle to the Ephesians.[41] And this is of course quite possible. But how are we to explain the last clause, ος εν παση επιστολη, etc.? Credner (*Einl.* i, p. 395), insisted that this clause must be corrected from the larger recension of the Ignatian epistles into ος παντοτε εν τοις δεησεσιν αυτου μνημονευει ημων (υμων). He was led to this emendation by his conviction that εν παση επιστολη could not be rendered "in tota epistola," viz., "in una tota," not "in omni epistola." The latter rendering in *every* epistle"" would, of course, not be true, for the five passages[42] where St. Paul casually mentions Ephesus, not the Ephesians, can hardly justify this rendering; but the rendering "in tota" or "in una tota epistola," "in one whole epistle," seems to be amply justified by the similar use of πας in the New Testament, cf. St. Math. ii, 3, and Rom. xi, 26. Now can we justify this expression of St. Ignatius by our present epistle to the Ephesians? We think it would be very hard to do so even if the saint read in the opening verse the words: εν Εφεσω. May we not justly ask then whether we now possess St. Paul's real epistle to the Ephesians? That *our* epistle was known to St. Ignatius is practically certain. Note his use of the characteristic words προοριζω and πληρωμα in the title of his own epistle to the Ephesians. It was certainly known to St. Polycarp who quotes (Phil. i,) our epistle ii, 8-9, χαριτι εστε σεσωσμενοι ουκ εξ εργων and especially in the same epistle (xii) where the Greek is wanting, but the Latin has "irascimini sed nolite peccare et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram," a combination only found in Ephes. iv, 26. But it does not follow that because the Apostolic Fathers use passages to be found in our epistle, they therefore held it to be the epistle to the Ephesians. Nor would we scout the idea of the real epistle to the Ephesians being lost, for that such losses could occur is clear from I Cor. v, 9-11. But what was the original epistle to the Ephesians like?

"Throughout his whole epistle he talks of you," says St. Ignatius. If he had said this of the Corinthians we should feel that the second

[41] It is interesting to note in an inscription from the Killanian plain an enumeration of the religious society of Muetæ of Zeus Sazavos during A. D. 207-8. Cf. Ramsay, *Cities, etc.*, p. 310.

epistle to the Corinthians would fully justify his words, for this epistle is full of affectionate remembrance of the Corinthians. Yet is not this epistle exactly what we should expect St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians to have been? And it is not an epistle like this which St. Ignatius seems to be referring to? Thus, note how often the word "brethren" occurs in the two Corinthian epistles—just three and thirty times, and in our epistle only thrice! And we may repeat what we pointed out above, viz., that Aristarchus while rendering greetings to the Colossians, yet sent no message to the Ephesians amongst whom he had worked and suffered.

To conclude, our Ephesian epistle does not bear upon it those evident marks we should expect to find. The very close similarity to the epistle to the Colossians would afford an *a priori* argument for assigning it to some neighboring church, and the Colossian epistle itself gives ground for supposing that some such epistle existed. The common view that the epistle to the Ephesians was a circular letter involves serious difficulties, and is perhaps only widely accepted because it seems at first blush so very simple. We have tried to show, moreover, that the Marcionite canon demands the existence of such an epistle to the Laodiceans, and the passage quoted from it by St. Epiphanius proves that the cento of passages from St. Paul, which now passes muster as the epistle to the Laodiceans was not the one referred to by St. Epiphanius, and moreover,, affords us good ground for supposing that the epistle to the Ephesians, known to St. Epiphanius was one and the same with the epistle to the Laodiceans, known to Marcion.

F. Hugh Pope.

---

[42] I Cor. xv, 32; xvi, 8; I Tim. i, 3; II Tim. i, 15; iv, 12.

STUDIES.

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE GREEK BIBLE

F. Hugh Pope, O. P.

Of recent years the study of the Greek Bible has made great strides. The publication of Swete's 'Old Testament in Greek" in 3 vols: 1887-1894, may be said to mark the starting point. It put into the hands of all students a full text with copious "apparatus criticus." This edition of the text was followed in 1900 by the publication of the same author's invaluable "Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek," and shortly after by Hatch and Redpath's great Concordance. And while these volumes were appearing a greater work was being done by both English and German scholars, viz., the discovery and decipherment of vast numbers of Papyri many of them written in Greek and dating from the fourth century before Christ. This is not the place in which to give the history of these discoveries, it will suffice to say here that, in addition to the now famous "Logia" of Our Lord, there have been recovered fragments more or less extensive of many important works, some of which we already possessed, but others though known indeed by name had been long since lost. To mention only a few names, during the present century there have been brought to light the lost treatise of Aristotle on the Politics of the Athenians, the lost "Antiope" of Euripides, and fragments of various works by well-known classical authors, such as Sophocles, Sappho, Alcæus, Pindar, Plato, Thucydides, etc. These represent only a small portion of the "finds" among the pagan classics, but the Biblical "finds" have been no less important; we need only mention the *Gospel of Peter*, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, the Greek Text of the *Book of Enoch*, the *Protovangelium* in a markedly different text from the one hitherto known, the hexaplar text of Ezechiel v, 12; vi, 3, portion of the *Ascension of Isaias*, fragments of the *Pastor* of Hermas, etc.

The interest of these "finds" is of course immense, but it is not so much these great works which have been of value to the students

of Old and New Testament Greek, as the stray leaves from every day correspondence, the scraps from note-books and account books, the invitations to dinner, the billet-doux, etc., which have been unearthed. It is the study of these lesser "finds" which has enabled modern scholars to revolutionize our previous ideas regarding Biblical Greek. And one of the revolutions they have brought about concerns the term just employed, viz., "Biblical Greek," for we can no longer use the term in the sense in which we have previously understood it.

We have always been taught to regard the Greek of the Old Testament as a curious patois resulting from the fact that Jews living in Egypt translated their sacred Books into Greek without an adequate knowledge of that language, and we have consequently been taught to group the vagaries which appear in every chapter of the Greek Bible under the one convenient heading of "Hebraisms." And as the Greek of the New Testament was regarded as the offspring of the Greek of the Septuagint, the same ideas held good with regard to it. The Greek of the Apostles and Evangelists was held to be Jewish Greek, and its deflections from classic usage were regarded as due to their imperfect knowledge of Greek.

All this has now been changed by the study of the Papyri. Swete in his *Introduction*, and above all, Deissmann in his *Bibel-studien* and *Neue-Bibel-studien*, which appeared in 1895 and 1897 and were translated into English in 1901 and 1903, have shown us that the language of the Greek Bible, both Old and New Testaments, is the veritable κοινη διαλεκτος the ordinary every day language of the then Greek-speaking world. Now that this has been pointed out it seems so simple and so necessary that we marvel how we never realized that St. Jerome had said it all long ago. How strange it seems now that we should never have noticed the fact that St. Paul wrote to his various Churches in the same unvarying and unclassical style whether his readers were in Europe or in Asia, whether they had come under the influence of the Septuagint or not!

We are all familiar with the legendary account of the translation of the Bible into Greek, a legend which has given its name to the version—the Septuagint. We call it legendary because it has been so embroidered about with legend that the kernel of truth is hidden, but in using the term "legendary" we do not mean to reject the story altogether. As Montfacon[1] insisted long ago, the view is so widespread,

[1] *Hexaplorum Origenis Quæ Supersunt Præliminaria*, p. 31, and cf. discussion of whole question, Swete, *Introd.* 10-20, and Appendix, where the Epistle of Aristæus is given in full.

and it can be traced back to a time so nearly contemporaneous with the events it relates, that its absolute falsity can hardly be possible.

But what does appear to be demonstrated is that the Greek Bible is not the work of seventy-two Jews imported into Egypt for the purpose. The Greek is that of Egypt; Egyptian words occur in it; it is the Greek of a people who speak it freely and handle it readily and are accustomed to express in it their everyday needs. The proofs of this are convincing and those generally given need not be repeated, they can be found at length in Swete's *Introduction*. We are concerned here with a feature of the version which explains the title of this paper, viz., the historical and geographical character of the Greek Bible. This feature has not, as far as we know, been dwelt upon though no careful student of the Septuagint can fail to have been struck by it.

Some of us may be acquainted with an old but invaluable book entitled *Undesigned Coincidences in the Bible*, by J. J. Blunt. Those who have read and studied that work will remember that the author tests the veracity of the Biblical narrative by an examination of minute historical and geographical points which tally with one another in such an accidental manner as to convince the reader of the Bible that the narrators knew well the facts they gave and also the localities around which those facts were woven. Now such a test would fail if applied to the Greek Bible for the simple reason that, as we shall see, the translators did not know the geography of Palestine and were only slightly acquainted with its history.

We propose, then, to take a series of passages hap-hazard from the Greek Bible in order to justify what might at first sight seem an exaggerated statement.

I.

That the Greek version was made in many instances from the Archaic Hebrew text and not from the so-called square letters is certain, and easily confused forms led to more or less serious errors. A very good instance of this occurs in Jer. xxv, 23,[2] where the last word, the familiar land of Buz disappears owing to a not unnatural

[2]Cod. Marchalianus (Q) reads in the margin Βως. As the readings of this codex will appear several times in the notes a few words about it may be of interest. It is in the Vatican Library and dates from the sixth century. The text is that of Hesychius, which is in itself of value but its special interest lies in the almost contemporary marginal notes taken from Origen's Hexaplar. The reader will notice how frequently these corrections are justified. Unfortunately this Mss. contains only the Prophets.

confusion between the Archaic forms of Beth and Rosh. The same confusion will explain *Ασερημα* for Sabama in Jer. xlviii, 32, while in *Δεβλαθα* lvii, 9, for Reblatha[3] we see a similar natural confusion between the Archaic forms of Daleth and Rosh. These might be multiplied largely but the interest for us lies in the fact that the translators did not instinctively recognize the familiar Biblical place-names.

A striking instance of this seeming want of familiarity with their own historical geography occurs in the prophecy of Osee.[4] He twice refers to the sin of Ephraim at Gabaa, namely the appalling story of crime which is so vividly told in Judges xix-xxi. We should have thought that so familiar an allusion would never have been passed over by Jews at all acquainted with their Bible, yet when we find that in both instances the LXX have translated Gabaa instead of transliterating it, we feel that the passage conveyed nothing to them.

II.

The unevenness of the Septuagint version is of course well-known, and is an index of the different hands which were at work on it and also of the different periods during which the work was accomplished. But what is not so well known is that different parts of the same book were probably translated by different men. The varying rendering of the proper names seems to prove this. Thus the valley of the sons of Hinnom is referred to as Tophet eight times in the Hebrew text of Jeremias.[5] Of the four occurrences in the ninth chapter one is omitted by the Septuagint; in xix, 6, it is referred to as *τω τοπω τουτω Διαπτωσις* and in xix, 12 and 13, as *ο τοπος ο διαπιπτων*. It is just possible, however, that this is an intentional mistranslation and may convey a rebuke, or it may be a play upon words, the key to which we have lost. Else where in Jeremias the Hebrew תפת is rendered *ταφεθ*.

Again, it is hardly credible that the Greek translators should have had any uncertainty about the name Sion, and yet twice over

[3]St. Jerome, and Montfaucon after him, explain this as due to a confusion between ד and ר in the square characters, but just the same confusion might arise with regard to the Archaic characters and the case of Pωs quoted above is conclusive, for ב and ר in square characters could not be confused. For other instances of confusion between the archaic forms of the letters, cf. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, (1897) pp. 290-296.

[4]Osee ix, 9; x, 9.

[5]vii, 11; vii, 32, (bis.); xix, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14; xix, 6, *Θαφεθ*. Q. margin; xix, 13, *Ταφεθ*. Q. margin.

in Isaias[6] we find the words חזיון rendered φαραγξ Σιων,[7] whereas it means "valley of vision," and the Hebrew for Sion is spelt quite differently, viz., ציון.

In other places we have mistranslations which can only be described as bewildering. Thus in Isaias ix, 11, where the Hebrew and Vulgate read "Philistines," and where the context demands this reading, the LXX has τους Ελληνας! One is almost tempted to think they must have read Pelasgim into Phelistim.

III.

In the Septuagint rendering of proper names we note a curious want of historical sense. Readers of the Vulgate will remember the two passages.[8] where Nebuchadnezzar is referred to under the strange term "columba," which the Douai version in despair translates literally. The Hebrew word יונה with which we are all familiar as the name of St. Peter's father, does, it is true, mean "dove," but the participle of יָנָה would have exactly the same form and means quite aptly "oppressing." The Greek translators, however, while recognizing the absurdity of rendering it by "dove" in these two passages, fall into a worse pitfall when they mistake it for יון, viz., Greece. It would be hard to imagine a more startling anachronism! The word occurs again in Jer. xxv, 38, though without any reference to Nebuchadnezzar, and the Greek interpreters are nearer the mark when they render it: απο προσωπου μαχαιρας της μεγαλης. In Sophonias iii, 1, however, they accept the inevitable and in both LXX and Vulgate we find: "Væ, provocatrix et redempta civitas, columba!" Note, however, that St. Jerome's punctuation of this paragraph is different. He reads: "Væ provocatrix et redempta civitas; columba non audivit vocem." The existing Hebrew text does not support him however.

His commentary on Jeremias was unfortunately never finished, but he refers to these passages when commenting on Soph. iii, 1. After giving the text from Sophonias, as quoted above, he says: "Many think that the context here demands an allusion to Niniveh, but Holy Scripture would never term Ninive a dove, though some indeed fancy that the words of Jeremias "a facie gladii columbæ" refer to Nebuchadnezzar. But others assert that instead of "columba" we

[6]Is. xxii, 1, 5.

[7]Here again, xxii, 1, the marginal corrector of Q is right ορασεως; while the corerctor of Cod. Sinaiticus ℵ is wrong φαραγγος ων.

[8]Jer. xlvi, 16, and L, 16.

should here read Ελλαδα, i. e., Greece," and he goes on to explain that the Hebrew word can be read either way.

IV.

Another class of geographical errors in the Greek Bible is undoubtedly due to a deficient knowledge of Hebrew. This sounds startling, but it is demonstrable. Thus it is remarkable how often the presence of the Hebrew article was not detected. To take an instance which we should have thought would never have occurred; the well-known Rechabites appear as εις οικον Αρχαβειν, Jer. xxv, 2.[9] where the "A" is merely the article. The same is the explanation of εληφθη Ακκαριωθ, Jer. xlviii, 41. for "capta est carioth." Many similar instances might be given. To this class we might assign the large number of instances where the LXX merely transliterates words which the translators do not understand, e. g., in Jos. xvii, 5, Λαβεκ for לבר, meaning "besides;" χαρσειθ for חרסית, meaning "fictilis" in Jer. xix, 2, etc., etc.

V.

In Osee x, 14, the Vulgate reads: "sicut vastatus est Salmana in domo ejus qui judicavit Baal in die prælii." We recognize Gideon of course, and Salmana, but it is hard to understand how the latter can be said to have been slain "in the house of" the former. When we turn to the Greek our bewilderment increases, for we read: Ως αρχων Σαλαμαν εκ του οικου,[10] Ιεροβααλ εν ημεραις πολεμου. Here Salmana is said to *belong* to the house of Gideon! It is worth while giving the Hebrew text in full: "כשד שלמן בית ארבאל ביום מלחמה."

In the first place the Greek translators as before confused the letters Daleth and Rosh, and read כשר, ως αρχων, instead of כשד," sicut destructio." But not content with merely deciphering the text, they read into it a completely false historical context and forced the Hebrew to fit it. They were convinced that the prophet was referring to Gideon and his slaughter of Salmana,[11] and so in spite of orthography they translated שלמן as though it was the צלמנע [12] of Judges, and

[9] Pαχαβειν. Q.
[10] Ιεροβααλ. A. Ιεροβοαμ. B. του Ιεροβοαμ. Q.
[11] Judges viii, and Ps. lxxxii.
[12] So Josephus. *Ant.* V. vi, 5. Zalmunna.

ארבאל as though it corresponded to the ירבעל of the same passage in Judges. The Hebrew text clearly means: "According to Salman's destruction of Beth-Arbela in the day of battle," probably referring to some event which is not clearly given, if at all, in the Bible; possibly we may see in Salman a reminiscence of שלמנעסר, viz., the Assyrian Shalmaneser, and we may find a parallel in IV Kings xvii, 3, while "Arbela" will find a parallel in I Macc, ix, 2. "Masaloth, which is in Arbela.' The case is interesting as showing us the exegetical methods used by the Greek translators and it certainly makes us marvel at the slightness of their knowledge of Hebrew. But there are difficulties in the proposed identification with Shalmaneser. The third king of that name (783-773) certainly made an inroad into the Lebanon in 775, and according to St. Jerome "De situ et Nominibus Locorum" Beth-Arbel was in the district of Pella across the Jordan. We cannot deny the possibility of Shalmaneser having also visited the trans-Jordanic territory, yet rarely, if ever, is an Assyrian king mentioned in the Bible by his name alone and without the addition "King of the Assyrians." Again, there is very slight ground for supposing that Shalmaneser could be referred to as Shalman, though according to Oppert (quoted by Schrader) there exists in London (presumably in the British Museum) a piece of ivory inscribed with the name Salmanu, but does it follow that it is the king of that name who is in question? On the other hand we know from the great triumphal inscription of Tiglath-Pileser III, in which he gives a list of the towns and countries which made submission to him, that contemporary with the prophet Osee there was a "Salman of Moab," and that the Moabites did make frequent inroads into Palestine is clear from II Kings xiii, 20 and xxiv, 2.

But what about Jerobaal or Gideon? We turn to St. Jerome's commentary on the passage and find the following amazing note:

"There can be no doubt," he says, "that Gideon is meant, for when men saw that after Gideon's destruction of the temple (fanum) of Baal, and after his hewing down the grove, Baal was not able to defend himself, they called Gideon 'Let Baal avenge himself.'..." St. Jerome finds, however, a difficulty in understanding on what occasion the Salmana, whom Gideon slew, destroyed mothers and their children, but he extricates himself from this by triumphantly quoting as of Salmana words which were, in fact, spoken by Samuel

[13]Cf Sayce. *H. C. M.* 482. Schrader, *The Cuneif. Inscript. and Old Test.* i, 248; ii, 140.

and addressed, not to Gideon but to Agag· "As thy sword hath made women childless, etc."[14] "In the same way, then," he concludes, "as Salmana was slain by Jerobaal, whom some wrongly take here for Jeroboam, the son of Nabat, who ruled over the ten tribes and was slain, as the Hebrew text has it, by Arbel (ארבאל), which means the same as Jerobaal, only it is expressed in a briefer form, so, etc." His statement about Jeroboam meets with no support from our present Hebrew text, but what is more astonishing from the philological standpoint is his identification of ארבאל and ירבעל.

We have here a very good instance of St. Jerome's extraordinary reverence for the Septuagint text. He denies indeed its inspiration, though it was commonly maintained in his time, but he never throws it over entirely. He marvels sometimes at its renderings, but he quotes them faithfully and, when possible, reads into them a spiritual or allegorical signification.

On occasions we feel that he is right in so doing for there can be no doubt that the LXX sometimes paraphrases rather than translates, and thus, gives the sense, or at least the allegorical sense, of the passage, rather than its strictly literal signification. For example, when in Jer. ii, 23, and xix, 2, the LXX instead of rendering "vide vias tuas in convalle" gives Ιδε τας οδους σου εν τω πολυανδριω. St. Jerome takes this as meaning "sepulcrum multitudinis," and proceeds to explain it firstly "juxta tropologiam" and then by an attempted historical view. But when he has done so he has after all given us no real explanation of the LXX rendering. If we may hazard a guess it is due to Ezechiel xxxix, 11, 15, 16, where the Hebrew text calls the sepulchre of Gog in the land of Israel "the valley of the multitude," גיא המון. Whether the translator had this expression before his eyes when at work on Jeremias or whether he read גיא בן-הנם as גיא המון we cannot decide. St. Jerome makes the same comment on these passages in Ezechiel as that given above from his commentary on Jeremias. He always feels bound to take the LXX seriously; thus in his comment on the LXX translation of Gabaa in Osee x, 9, which we referred to above, he explains their rendering *βουνοι*, "colles" as referring to the Church. Compare also his treatment of the LXX text of Zach. xii, 10, Isaias x, 9 and xxii, 1.

VI.

Another remarkable instance of want of the historical and geographical sense, occurs in Sophonias ii, 5-6. The Hebrew reads:

[14] I Sam. xv, 33.

"Woe to the dwellers by the seashore, nation of the Cherethi, the word of the Lord is against you Canaan, land of the Philistine...and the seashore shall be pastures, wells for the shepherds and cotes for the sheep." The parallelism here proves that the translation "Cherethi" is justified, and we are of course reminded of the Cherethi and Phelethi,[15] who constituted David's bodyguard. The Vulgate destroys the parallel by rendering "perditorum" instead of "Cherethi." St. Jerome has taken it as the participle of the verb כרת "to cut off."

The Greek runs: *Ουαι οι κατοικουντες το σχοινισμα της θαλασσης παροικοι κρητων*, etc.

They have given a perfect rendering to the word we have translated by "seashore;" it means literally "the rope of the sea," and clearly refers to the long strip of sea-coast occupied by the Philistines. But how amazing it is that they should have completely forgotten the Cherethi themselves! It is true that these latter probably came, as did perhaps the Philistines, from Crete, but here there is no question of Crete itself. Yet so blinded are the Greek translators by the idea that it is the Cretans and Crete itself which is in question that they pass over the opening words of v, 6: "And the seashore shall be," and render כרת, which means "wells" by *κρητη*.

St. Jerome's commentary on this passage is worthy of note: "It is not easy," he says, "to understand its spiritual signification nor the LXX translation, especially since editions of the latter vary. For where we have put 'gens perditorum' they have 'advenæ cretensium,' and where the Hebrew has *Goi Chorethim* (גוי כרתים), the LXX have read *gar* for *goi*, which means 'nation,' and have rendered it by 'advenam.' Moreover, they have supposed that by *Chorethim* which means 'perditorum,' the island Crete was intended. Aquila and the fifth version have rendered it *εθνος ολεθριον*; Theodotion translates it *εθνος ολεθριας* and Symmachus likewise *εθνος ολεθευομενον*, all of which renderings agree with ours. Again, where we have given 'Et erit funiculus maris requies pastorum,' a rendering in which all interpreters agree, the LXX have 'Et erit Creta pascua gregis et ovile pecorum.' Consequently, comparing spiritual meanings with spiritual and keeping to the path mapped out for us by the Vulgate edition which we follow, we must ask whether Crete is mentioned anywhere else in Holy Scripture." He then turns to Titus i, 11-12: "The Cretans are always liars, etc.," and works out a homily on the passage, but if he had wanted an historical parallel he might have turned to the

[15] II Sam. viii, 18.

LXX version of Ezechiel xxx, 5, where in place of the Hebrew reading "Aethiopia and Libya and the Lydians, the LXX has: "The Persians and the *Cretans* and the Lydians."

VII.

Take yet another instance. We should have thought that Thirza, the capital of Jeroboam, would have been well known, yet in Cant. vi, 4, the whole parallelism is spoilt both by the Greek and Latin translators. The Latin runs "pulchra es, amica mea, suavis et decora sicut Jerusalem." We should at once suspect a misrendering since a parallel to Jerusalem is required. The Greek has almost seized the true meaning: *καλη ει η πλησιον μου,ως ευδοκια, ωραια, ως Ιερουσαλημ*, but the verse should run: "Pulchra es, amica mea sicut Thirza, decora sicut Jerusalem."

VIII.

A still more remarkable instance occurs in the translation of the term Shichor, "the river of Egypt." This sometimes refers to the Nile as in Isaias xxiii, 3, and Jeremias ii, 18. At other times it represents the present Wady el-Arish or Rhinocolura,[16] in South West Palestine. We might naturally expect the Egyptian Jews to render the Hebrew שיחור by one of these terms, but they do not do so; thus in Jos. xiii, 3, where the Hebrew reads: "from the Shichor which is before Egypt," the Greek has *απο της αοικητου της κατα προσωπον Αιγυπτου*, and the Vulgate, which here confuses the Wady with the Nile, reads: "a fluvio turbido qui irrigat Aegyptum," this is clearly only a paraphrase. Similarly, I Paralip. xiii, 5, where the Hebrew has: "from the Shichor of Egypt even to the entrance of Emath," the Greek renders this by: *απο οριων Αιγυπτου* and the Vulgate: "a Sihor Aegypti...." Again, in Isaias xxiii, 3, the Hebrew has: "and in many waters, the seed of the Shichor, the harvest of the Nile," where the two rivers are paced in opposition, or may possibly be identified as the parallelism seems to indicate. The Greek, however, misses the point altogether. It translates *εν υδατι πολλω σπερμα μεταβολων*. Moreover it leaves out the second member of the parallel and thus completely destroys the beauty of the passage. Nor is the Vulgate much better when it renders: "in aquis multis semen Nili messis fluminis."

[16] Isaias xxvii, 12. (LXX).

Lastly, in Jer. ii, 18, where the Hebrew has "And now what hast thou to do with going down to Egypt, with drinking the waters of the Schicor?" the Greek renders: *και νυν τι σοι και τη οδω Αιγυπτου, του πιειν υδωρ;*,[17] and the Vulgate: "ut bibas aquam turbidam?" Whether the Greek translators were here thinking of the Gihon near Jerusalem or whether they confused the Gihon of Genesis with the Nile, we cannot decide. The fact remains that for them the term Shichor, occurring in four different places in the Bible, was a mystery even though it was concerned with that very Egypt in which they were living.

St. Jerome discusses the question of the identity of this torrent in his commentary on Isaias xxvii, 12. "We might," he says, "interpret 'the stream of the river' as referring to the Euphrates, as we read in the 71st Psalm, 'He shall rule from sea to sea, and from *the river* unto the ends of the earth.' Others suggest the Jordan, but we must note that the torrent on the frontier between Judaea and Egypt may be called a river; its waters are turbid but not perennial. Instead of 'torrent of Egypt' the LXX render by 'Rhinocoura,' the name of a town on the frontier between Palestine and Egypt; they thus give rather the meaning of Holy Scripture than its literal interpretation." That the Hebrews did identify the river Gihon of Genesis ii, 13, with the Nile is clear from Josephus *Ant.* vi, 1, 3, but that this identification was not universal is shown by Ecclus. xxiv, 35-37. The writer contrasts in v, 35 and 36 the Phison and the Tigris, the Euphrates and the Jordan; in v, 37, the text now reads: "Who sendeth knowledge as the light and riseth up as Gihon in the time of the vintage." The parallelism demands the name of a river where we now read "light" and the mistake is easy to rectify; אור means "light," יאור is the name frequently given to the Nile, the two are contrasted in Amos viii, 8. But it follows that in Ecclus. xxiv, 37, the "Gihon" cannot mean the Nile. That the boundary of Palestine to the South was a river, whether perennial or not, and that this river was not the Nile, seems to follow convincingly from Amos vi, 14. "Et conteret vos ab introitu Emath usque ad torrentem deserti." The LXX reads *του χειμαρρου των δασμων*, "the torrent of the west." St. Jerome notices this reading when he writes: "Rhinocolura, a city by the torrent of the desert, or of the West, as the LXX have translated it; between it and Pelusium, a branch of the Nile, or a torrent coming from the desert enters the sea."[18]

[17] Σιωρ. Q. margin.

[18] *Notationes de aliquot Palæstinæ locis ex comment. supra Amos.* vi.

IX.

We have already pointed out passages where the translators have failed to grasp the guide which the spirit of Hebrew poetry put into their hands, viz., parallelism. A good instance of this occurs in Cant. iv, 8. In this verse there are three distichs each containing their parallel; the second reads in the Hebrew and in the Vulgate "de capite Amana, de vertice Sanir et Hermon," but the Greek translators failed to recognize the mountains of Amana and so rendered it: *απ αρχης πιστεως* thus completely destroying the balance of the sentence. At the same time it should be noted that the converse sometimes takes place, and it is the Vulgate which makes the mistake. Thus in Sophonias ii, 13, the Hebrew reads: "He will...destroy Assyria and make Nineveh a desolation." The Septuagint has expressed the meaning perfectly, but the Vulgate by endeavoring to translate נינוה and rendering it "speciosam" has missed the real significance of the passage.

X.

When the good king Josias was slain by Pharoah Nechao in the valley of Megiddo we are told that "Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josias, and Jeremias lamented for Josias, and all the singing men and singing women spake of Josias in their lamentations unto this day."[19] This is undoubtedly referred to nearly a hundred years later by Zacharias the Prophet: "In that day there shall be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadad-Rimmon in the vale of Megiddo."[20] This universal lamentation was, then, a well-remembered fact, as well-known as the lamentation which the Hebrews made for Jacob.[21] Yet the Greek translators did not recognize the historical allusion in Zacharias, they render it: "mourning in Jerusalem like the mourning of the pomegranate in the plain of the slain."

XI.

The Hebrew points of the compass were sometimes a stumbling block to the translators. The West was expressed by the term מים literally "from the sea," because the Mediterranean was to the West of Palestine. Twice over in Josue viii, the translator renders this literally and consequently with the most ludicrous geographical re-

[19]II Paralip. xxxv, 22-35.
[20]Zach. xii, 11.
[21]Gen. L, 10-11.

sults. Here we are told that the army of Josue[22] went and lay in ambush between Bethel and Hai *to the West of Hai.* The Greek renders the words in italics: απο θαλασση της Γαι as though they thought there was a sea at Hai as at Cinneroth!

Similar confusion arises from the use of the term קדם to signify the East. Thus in Jeremias xlvi, 28: "Arise ye, go up to Cedar, and spoil the children of the East," whence the people of Cedar came. The Greek transliterates this and renders in consequence: "and spoil the children of Kedem."

XII.

The word עמק means "valley," and is naturally of frequent occurrence. The rendering of it by the Greek translators of Josue is instructive. In that book it occurs thirteen times; eight times the Greek merely transliterates it Εμεκ or Αιμακ; thrice it renders it by φαραγξ, thrice by κοιλας. Nothing could be more inconsistent. It seems as though they had no guiding principles in their rendering of proper names. In one single verse Jos. xvii, 16, the word is once transliterated and once translated, thus where the Revised Version reads: "The hill-country is not enough for us, and all the Canaanites that dwell in the land of the valley have chariots of iron, both they who are in Beth-shean and her towns, and they who are in the valley of Jezreel." The Septuagint reads: "εν τη γη Εμεκ. . . . εν τη κοιλαδι Ιεζραελ."

XIII.

Some of these blunders on the part of the LXX are naive in the extreme; thus we read in the Vulgate and Douay version of Amos i, 6 and 9: "I will not convert them (Gaza and Tyre) because they shut up a complete captivity in Edom." This is a very bald rendering of the Hebrew, though its meaning is clear, but the LXX have mistaken שלמה viz., "complete," for שלומה meaning "Solomon." It would seem as though the translators never cast about to see if their rendering involved any historical blunder.

At the same time we not infrequently find that the LXX, even in proper names, have given us a rendering which seems preferable to that adopted by St. Jerome. Thus we can profitably contrast their respective renderings of Amos i, 4-5.

[22] Jos. viii, 9, 12.

LXX.	St. Jerome.
Et emittam ignem in domum Azæl, et devorabit fundamenta filii Ader et conteram vectes Damasci, et disperdam habitatores de campo .... Et concidam tribum ex viris Charran, et captivus ducetur populus Syriæ nominatus.	Et mittam ignem in domum Azæl et devorabit domos Benhadad. Et conteram vectem Damasci, et disperdam habitatores de campo idoli, tenentem sceptrum de domo voluptatis, et transferetur populus Syriæ Cyrenen.

It will be seen that the LXX have consistently rendered by proper names throughout; thus note "the field of *On*" and "the men of Charran," in place of the "campus idoli" and "domus voluptatis" St. Jerome. Of course there are mistakes in this LXX rendering, but it is curious that while St. Jerome points them out, e. g., "filii Ader" where they have read ד instead of ר, and "Charran" where they have read ערן for עדן, he yet fails to notice how much more apt is their translation than the one which he follows. It seems as though he was unable at times to resist the authority of Symmachus. The word קיר which St. Jerome renders "Cyrene" both here and in ix, 7 and IV Kings xvi, 9, on the authority of Symmachus, always proves a stumbling block to the LXX. Here they render it επικλητος; in ix, 7, εκ βοθρου; in IV Kings xvi, 9, την πολιν; and one wonders what the Hebrew original of the name Κυρηνην was in I Maccabees xv, 23.

XIV.

In Obadiah xx we have the famous difficulty, "quæ in Bosphoro est." The modern name comes upon us with a shock. The Hebrew is ספרד; the LXX amuses us by the rendering Εφραθα though the margin in Q gives Σφαραδ. St. Jerome quotes the LXX text as reading "Euphraten," but in commenting on it he gives Ephrata as their rendering. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion merely transliterate the Hebrew. St. Jerome says that the Jew who taught him insisted that it meant the Bosphorus and that he gave a Rabbinical explanation of the passage. He himself, however, suggests that it may refer to a district of the Babylonian Empire, "though," he adds, "I would suggest another interpretation, for when the Prophets speak against Babylon, the Ammonites, Moabites, Philistines, etc., they are wont in many instances to lay aside the terms belonging to their own language and to make use of those of the provinces in question; since then in the Assyrian tongue "frontier," which in Hebrew is "Gebul,"

is signified by Sapharad, I would suggest that the meaning is that the captivity of Jerusalem which has been scattered *into all districts and regions* shall inherit. etc., etc."

By the "Assyrian tongue" he presumably means the Syrian, which possesses the root ספר, meaning to "divide." The name Sparda is of frequent occurrence in the Assyrian and Persian monuments, thus Schrader[23] quotes from the great Inscription of Darius at Behistun: "The Armentanos, Cappadocians, Sparda, the Ionians of the mainland, and those of the Islands," and he in consequence decides in favor of Sardis. Sayce[24] argues for Bithynia or Galatia, while others, e. g., Knudtzon, argue for a Saparda in South West Media, mentioned in the time of Sargon. There is also a Saparda North-East of Nineveh mentioned in the time of Esarhaddon.[25]

XV.

The city of Alexandria is five times mentioned in the Vulgate. St. Jerome candidly allows (on Ezech. xxx, 14), that this town can only be mentioned "per anticipationem; and he quotes Virgil in support of such a prolepsis! The Hebrew word is נא which is probably taken over from the Coptic. As we should naturally expect, the Hebrews dwelling so long in Egypt are familiar with this Coptic term and generally identify it with Thebes which was the greatest of Egyptian towns, notwithstanding the word of St. Jerome, who says: "parva civitas est!" In Ezech. xxx, 14, the LXX renders the word correctly by Διοσπολις, viz., Thebes, in the next verse by Memphis, in the next by Diospolis again; in Jer. xlvi, 25, they render it Ammon which is fairly correct as Thebes was called after its great deity; in Nah. iii, 8, they hopelessly mistranslate the rest of the verse, indeed they seem to have had a different Hebrew text; but they render this word again by Ammon. Thus only once are they mistaken, viz., when they translate it Memphis.

This is as it should be, as also is St. Jerome's ignorance of the site in question, for Egyptian geography would naturally not be very well known to him. At the same time he sometimes makes us realize the keenness of his geographical insight, thus in Ezech. xxix, 10 and xxx, 12, we find the tower of Syene mentioned. The prophet threatens that Egypt shall be devastated from the tower of Syene to

[23] *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and O. T.*, ii, 145.

[24] H. C. M. 483. and cf. *Records of Past* (New Series) vol. vi, p. viii.

[25] Cf. Brown and Driver, *Heb. and Engl. Lexicon. s. v.*

the furthest border of Ethiopia. This is an intelligible expression, it means that Nubia, the district which the Egyptians were always striving to control should be wasted with the sword. But when the LXX interpreters render: "from Magdala and Syene and to the confines of Ethiopia," we feel that their geographical sense is at fault; it is like saying "from John o' Groats and Birmingham to Land's End." St. Jerome points this out and at the same time shows more acquaintance with Egyptian topography than might have been expected, for he adds: "the tower of Syene remains to this day, and is a fortified Roman camp standing beside the cataracts of the Nile."

XVI.

This same chapter (Ezech. xxx), will furnish us with another interesting example. The Vulgate reads in v, 15: "I will pour out my indignation upon Pelusium...and Pelusium shall groan." The Hebrew word is סין and the present text of the LXX renders it first by Σαιν then by Συνην, though the LXX text read by St. Jerome had Σαιν in both places. He himself gives no reason for rendering it Pelusium beyond his notion that since it is termed in the text "robur Aegypti" it must have been a great port, as Pelusium certainly was. Sais, however, was an important town of the Delta and had given its name to a Dynasty of Pharaohs. It would seem better here, then, to follow the guidance of the Eygptianized translators who would most certainly have been familiar with the spot.

St. Jerome generally, as we have mentioned above, adheres to Symmachus' renderings but he sometimes deserts him just when he would perhaps have done better to keep to him. Thus in Ezech. xxvii, 11, the Vulgate reads: "sed et Pygmæi, qui erant in turribus tuis." We are naturally startled at reading of the Pygmies, though the monuments show us that they were known to the Egyptians. The Hebrew reads: וגמדים; the LXX, though Mss. differ, φυλακες which certainly makes good sense. Aquila, however, rendered it "Pygmæi," which St. Jerome followed. Now Symmachus had read: "Medos," and the context certainly makes this reasonable since the prophet has just mentioned the Persians, Lydians and Libyans. And that the Hebrew really means "sed et Medos," is practically certain. The Hebrew word in question is גמדים, which is easily split up into גם-מדים "the Medes also."

In this connection we might note the blunder in Ezech. xxv, 9. The prophet is inveighing against Moab, Ammon and Edom; the Hebrew text has "Beth-Jesimoth, Baal-Meor and Cariathaim." This last word, it is true, occurs in rather a curious form, viz., קריתמה, but the LXX, absolutely oblivious of the locality in question, split up the last two Hebrew names and read: Βεθιαισμουθ επανω πηγης πολεως παραθαλασσιας. It is not difficult to see how they got this out of the Hebrew but it shows a complete ignorance of Moabitic geography. St. Jerome cites their translation, but makes no comment.

We have said enough to show that the translators of the Greek Bible were weak in the historical geography of the Holy Land, and we have also shown that even their knowledge of Hebrew was at times deficient. And in doing this we do them no injustice. It is as we should expect. The translators were, it is true, "Hebrews of the Hebrews," but they essentially belonged to the dispersion. They lived outside the Holy Land and many of them probably had never set foot in it. Hebrew was not for them the regular medium of conversation. Greek, that κοινη διαλεκτος, which we find in their translation and which the recently-discovered papyri have brought so vividly before us, must have been their normal speech. The traveller in civilized parts of Egypt now is amazed at the many languages he hears spoken. English, French and Arabic are at the ready command of many. And so also the traveller of the days of Ptolemy Philadelphos would have found the Egyptians at least bilingual in his day: the natives would use the demotic descendant of the language enshrined in the monuments, that curious form of speech which is only now yielding up its secrets to the learned investigator, and they would also speak Greek, being compelled thereto by the fact that it was the only medium of communication with the countless strangers who flocked into the land, and with that vast horde of mercenaries who filled the armies of the Ptolemies. The Hebrews would keep their own tongue or rather its Arabic form as the Assouan Papyri have recently shown us in so startling a manner, but they, too, would be compelled to speak Greek outside their own circles.

We do the translators no discredit, then, when we point out where their weakness lay. Indeed, we should be loath to throw discredit on them, for the more we study their Bible the more we marvel at the work they succeeded in doing. It was through them and them alone that the Gentile world was to learn God's revealed truth. The Word of Life Himself was to use their version and His Apostles were to

spread it all over the world. Even in the West it was for long years *the* Bible, for the old Vulgate, as St. Jerome calls it, was nothing but a literal rendering of the LXX. It is only in these latter days that the LXX has fallen into the background; and that is due to the glorious labors of one who built up his vast scholarship on the study of the Greek Bible and its various translators and who was only thus enabled to give us that Vulgate edition which justly ranks as "The Queen of Versions."

HUGH POPE.

DIVORCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

AN EXEGETICAL STUDY (VI).

Francis E. Gigot

In our last article, we examined the passage of St. Matthew (v, 31-32) which sets forth Our Lord's teaching concerning divorce with the significant clause: παρεκτος λογου πορνειας "except because of fornication." The passage, as we pointed out, is one of the antitheses grouped together by our first Evangelist in the fifth chapter of his Gospel, for the general purpose of illustrating the manner in which Christ's doctrine, although in direct opposition to the received interpretation of the Law by the Jewish authorities of the time, nevertheless did not destroy but fulfilled the Law (Cfr. Mt. v, 17-20). Thus viewed, Mt. v, 31-32:

Mt. v.

31. It was said also:
Whoever shall put away his wife
let him give her a bill of divorce.
32. But I say to you that
Everyone putting away his wife
except because of fornication
makes her commit adultery,
and whoever shall marry one put away,
commits adultery,

has for its special object to show that Our Lord's doctrine concerning divorce, although opposed to that of the Jewish teachers of the day, far from running counter to the classical text of Deuteronomy xxiv, 1-4, regarding divorce, fulfils it to its "yod" or "tittle." On the basis of this Deuteronomic passage:

Deuter. xxiv.

1. When a man taketh a wife and marrieth her, and it cometh to pass, if she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found in her some indecency that he writeth her a bill of divorce, and delivereth [it] into her hand, and putteth her out of his house,

2. and she departeth out of his house, and goeth and becometh another man's [wife],

3. and the latter man hateth her and writeth her a bill of divorce, and delivereth [it] into her hand, and putteth her out of his house; or if the latter man who took her as his wife, die;

4 her former husband who put her away, is not allowed to take her again to be his wife,

after that she is defiled: for this is an abomination before Yahweh, and thou shalt not cause to sin
the land which Yahweh, thy God, giveth thee [as] an inheritance,

the official expounders of the Law maintained that Moses had considered as lawful the action of a man who, for whatever cause, dismissed his wife by means of a bill of divorce; and in consequence, they confidently proclaimed in their synagogues the traditional rule quoted in Mt. v, 31:

> Whoever shall put away his wife,
> let him give her a bill of divorce.

According to them, whoever acted upon this rule, secured fully the righteousness of the law: by the bill of divorce he had enabled his dismissed his wife to remarry lawfully, and therefore was not responsible for any adultery on her part after he had thus put her away. Whoever, on the contrary, went against this rule, was positively wrong: by withholding the bill of divorce which alone would have enabled his dismissed wife to unite herself lawfully to another man,[1] the husband maliciously exposed her to an adulterous union after he had refused to live any more with her.[2] Over against this Jewish interpretation of Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, our first Evangelist sets in Mt. v, 32:

> But I say to you that
> Everyone putting away his wife
> except because of fornication
> makes her commit adultery,
> and whoever shall marry one put away,
> commits adultery,

a very different one which he represents as the positive teaching of Christ to His disciples concerning divorce. In the eyes of St. Matthew, the traditional rule of the Jews was decidedly incorrect: it not only set aside the cause required by Israel's lawgiver from the man who was determined to put away his wife, viz. "because he hath found in her some indecency" ערות דבר; but it also treated as lawful the remarriage of a dismissed wife who was supplied with a bill of divorce, whereas Moses had spoken of this remarriage as an adulterous defilement: "after that she is defiled." The doctrine of Christ, on the contrary, fulfilled perfectly, according to our first Evangelist, the

[1]Cfr. Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book IV, chap. viii, 23.

[2]This is exactly the manner in which the malice of the withholding of a bill of divorce by Papos ben Juda, is described in the Talmudic treatise *Sota*, chap. i, 7. (Talmud transl. by M. Schwab, vol. vii, p. 236).

requirements of the Deuteronomic text, in this twofold respect: a dismissed wife cannot remarry without committing adultery together with the man who marries her, and the dismissing husband is responsible for that adultery, if he puts her away without the specified cause: "except because of fornication" (the Greek: λογος πορνειας, being treated as the equivalent of the Hebrew: ערות דבר).

Such is the natural meaning of the antithesis in Mt. v, 31-32, when considered in relation to the fulfilment of Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, that is, in a relation manifestly intended by our first Evangelist. Such is the meaning which we established in our foregoing article, and in virtue of which we concluded that Mt. v, 31-32, like the passages of the other early documents of Christianity examined before, ascribes to Our Lord the absolute rejection of divorce which the Roman Catholic Church has always enforced as Christ's own doctrine concerning that great ethical question. Such is also the meaning which, as can be readily seen, it behooves us distinctly to bear in mind while endeavoring to determine the exact sense of Mt. xix, 3-12, the last passage which remains to be examined to complete our exegetical Study on Divorce in the New Testament: this last passage, like the one studied in the foregoing paper, is found in St. Matthew's Gospel, and sets forth Our Lord's teaching concerning divorce with a restrictive clause as to fornication: "nisi ob fornicationem."

The following is the literal English rendering of this last important passage:

Mt. xix.

3. And Pharisees approached Him
tempting Him and saying:
Is it lawful to put away one's wife
for every cause?

4. But He answering said: Have you not read that
the Creator[3] from the beginning
made them male and female, 5. and said:
On account of this a man shall leave his father and his mother,
and shall cleve to his wife,
and the two shall become one flesh?

6. so that they are no longer two, but one flesh.
What therefore God has joined together,
let not man put asunder.

7. They say to Him:
Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce
and to put away?

[3]The reading ο κτισας is original rather than the alternate: ο ποιησας (Cfr. Mk. x, 6).

8. He says to them that
Moses for your hardness of heart
allowed you to put away your wives:
but from the beginning it was not so.
9. But I say to you that
Whoever shall put away his wife
unless for fornication (μη επι πορνεια)
and shall marry another (και γαμηση αλλην),[4]
commits adultery, (μοιχαται),
and the one put away marrying (και ο απολελυμενην γαμησας)
commits adultery (μοιχαται).
10. The disciples say to Him.
If so be the case of the man with the wife
it is not expedient to marry.
11. But He said to them:
All do not receive this saying,
but they to whom it is given.
12. For there are eunuchs who were so born from their mother's womb;
and there are eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men;
and there are eunuchs who made themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of heaven.
He who can receive [it], let him receive [it].

II. Two Previous General Remarks.

Before examining this long passage, it may not be amiss to premise two general remarks. The first bears on the fact that Mt. xix, 3-12, is closely parallel to Mk. x, 2-12, which also relates a discussion of Our Lord with "Pharisees" concerning the lawfulness of divorce. Indeed, the more one studies the resemblances and differences between Mt. xix, 3-12, and Mk. x, 2-12, the more clearly also he realizes that he is here in presence of one of those numerous cases in which St. Matthew depends on St. Mark's text and adapts it for the special purpose of his own apologetics against the Jews. Now, as in all other such cases, our first Evangelist modifies St. Mark's primitive

[4]The text which we have adopted in verse 9 and which underlies our Vulgate: "nisi ob fornicationem, et aliam duxerit, moechatur; et qui dimissam duxerit, moechatur," is undoubtedly genuine. The various readings found in certain ancient authorities and more or less implicitly followed by some modern editors, are due to a more or less complete scribal assimilation to the parallel passage in Mt. v, 32. The omission of the last part: και ο απολελυμενην γαμησας μοιχαται in particular, has also been explained through omœteleuton (Cfr. H. Alford, *the Greek Testament*, vol. i, 6th edit., p. 194; H. W. A. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of St. Matthew*, Engl. transl., p. 335. New York. Funk & Wagnalls. 1884; Jos., Knabenbauer, S. J., *Comm. in S. Matthaeum*, vol. ii, p. 138; W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew*, p. 207. New York. 1907; etc.)

text in such a way as to remain in substantial agreement with it, it is antecedently probable that he has done so here, and that consequently, Mt. xix, 3-12, ascribes to Jesus the same absolute opposition to divorce as is undoubtedly ascribed to Him in Mk. x, 2-12, (Cfr. The New York Review, Jan.-Feb., 1907, pp. 479-494). Our second general remark bears on another fact already alluded to, viz. that both Mt. xix, 3-12, and Mt. v, 31-32, have one and the same restrictive clause as to fornication, for the phrase: μη επι πορνεια, "unless for fornication" in Mt. xix, 9c, is obviously meant by our first Evangelist as the equivalent of the parallel clause: παρεκτος λογου πορνειας "except because of fornication" in Mt. v, 32c. Now, since in our foregoing article on Divorce in the New Testament, we have shown that in Mt. v, 31-32, this restrictive clause does not set forth a ground for divorce, a clause that would allow remarriage after the separation of husband and wife, it is antecedently probable that in Mt. xix, 3-12, the same clause should not be understood in a different manner.

Of course, these are only antecedent probabilities, which, as such, should not be considered as settling the question at issue. In an exegetical study, like the present, the exact doctrine ascribed to Our Lord in an early document of Christianity, must be actually derived from a thorough investigation of the text which bodies it forth. And on this account, we now proceed to determine the teaching of Jesus concerning divorce contained in Mt. xix, 3-12, through an impartial and careful examination of this passage of our first Evangelist.

III. Christ's Teaching in Mt. xix, 3-6. The unbiassed interpreter of Mt. xix, 3-12, needs not proceed very far with his reading of the passage to meet the place where our first Evangelist distinctly sets forth Our Lord's doctrine concerning divorce. He indeed readily sees that this doctrine is not given in the opening verse:

> Mt. xix, 3.
> And Pharisees approached Him
> tempting Him and saying:
> Is it lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?

which manifestly records, not words of Jesus, but a question of His opponents anxious to betray Him into a public answer regarding divorce with which they may find fault. But He no less readily

recognizes a statement of Christ's own teaching in regard to that ethical question, in the very next verses of the passage:

Mt. xix.

4. But He answering said: Have you not read that
the Creator from the beginning
made them male and female, 5. and said:
On account of this a man shall leave his father and his mother,
and shall cleave to his wife,
and the two shall become one flesh?
6. so that they are no longer two, but one flesh.
What therefore God has joined together,
let not man put asunder.

His first, and indeed most natural, impression in reading attentively these verses, is that taken in their obvious sense, they ascribe to Jesus an absolute denial of the lawfulness of divorce; and the more closely he examines their wording, the more distinctly he realizes that, to any and every unprejudiced mind, this must needs appear their actual sense. The first text of the Law (Gen. i, 27), which Jesus quotes for His adversaries, is a clear proof that He argues here in favor of the indissolubility of the marriage tie:

Mt. xix, 4.

But He answering said: Have you not read
that the Creator from the beginning
made them male and female.

By these words, Our Lord recalls to His opponents the fact that the union which exists between husband and wife is not of human origin, that a man should presume to break it. Its origin goes back to "the Creator" whose supreme will is permanently imprinted in the very constitution of both the one and the other: at the very moment that God created the two sexes, He manifestly meant that they should be knit together in the marriage bond, with the nature and sacredness of which no man should interfere. With this first text, Jesus couples another, taken also from the Mosaic Law (Gen. ii, 24), and bearing directly on the manner of union which God expressly willed should for ever exist between husband and wife through the marriage intercourse:

Mt. xix.

5. And said:
On account of this a man shall leave his father and his mother
and shall cleave to his wife,
and the two shall become one flesh;

to which He adds at once His own inference from the text just quoted:

Mt. xix, 6a.
so that they are no longer two, but one flesh.

This second text is manifestly adduced by Jesus to confirm most powerfully the indissoluble nature of the conjugal tie, which He has urged upon His adversaries by means of His first Mosaic quotation: what the Creator really meant in establishing the structural unity described in Gen. i, 27, he has himself explicitly set forth in Gen. ii, 24: "*And sa'd: On account of this,* etc." It is God's distinct will, that a man shall ever look upon the union entailed by marriage intercourse, as more intimate and more sacred than even that close union which God also has established between a child and the authors of his life:

Mt. xix.
5. And said:
On account of this a man shall leave his father and his mother
and shall cleave to his wife.

It is God's explicit will that a man shall always consider the consummation of marriage as actually making of him and his wife, only one principle of physical life:

Mt. xix, 5d.
and the two shall become one flesh.

Whence Christ's immediate, and obviously ready, inference: after the consummation of marriage, husband and wife have ceased to be one man and one woman able to unite themselves in lawful wedlock to whom they would; they are now husband and wife; they belong together and form one indivisible principle of human life:

Mt. xix, 6a.
so that they are no longer two, but one flesh.

Thus it appears evident to this unbiased interpreter, that Jesus quotes here these two texts together, for the distinct purpose of showing, that, from the Law itself, God has always willed that the marriage tie be regarded as indissoluble. Christ's mind is manifestly set against the lawfulness of divorce, and He wants His hearers to realize most distinctly that the sundering of the marriage tie is against God's primitive and unchanged will. In fact, every possibility of a doubt in this regard, He positively excludes by adding of His own accord the conclusion which most necessarily follows from His previous words:

Mt. xix.
6b. What therefore God has joined together
6c. let not man put asunder.

Divorce, allowed by whatever man, legislation, or State, is unlawful because it is contrary to God's primitive, supreme, explicit, and unchanged will.

Such then, undoubtedly, is the plain meaning of the words which our first Evangelist places on Christ's lips in Mt. xix, 4-6. In recording them, therefore, he must have realized that he was thereby ascribed to Jesus an emphatic denial of the lawfulness of divorce, as His own distinct doctrine concerning that great ethical question. And in point of fact, whoever studies impartially these same words of Christ in the light of their immediately preceding context, is led to the conclusion that St. Matthew placed them in that context with the actual view that they expressed an absolute rejection of that lawfulness on the part of his Master.

As it can readily be seen, this preceding context is made up of two several elements. The first consists in a captious question put to Jesus by "Pharisees" and related by the Evangelist in the following terms:

Mt. xix, 3.
And Pharisees approached Him
tempting Him and saying:
Is it lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?

The second element is St. Matthew's own formula of introduction of Our Lord's words as an answer to that very question:

Mt. xix.
4. *But He answering said*: Have you not read that
the Creator from the beginning
made them male and female....

Of these two elements, the latter affords us direct access to St. Matthew's personal frame of mind at the precise moment he was contemplating the introduction of the words of Christ which we have examined. At that very moment, he distinctly viewed those words as Christ's *own* answer: "*He* answering said" (ο αποκριθεις ειπεν), and as an answer of His *in opposition* to the captious question of Christ's adversaries: "*But* He answering said" ο δε αποκριθεις ειπεν).

Having thus realized the Evangelist's exact frame of mind in wording the second element of the context which precedes immediately the words of Jesus in Mt. xix, 4-6, the careful interpreter proceeds to examine in its light the other element of that context, viz. the ensnaring question related by the same Evangelist in Mt. xix, 3:

And Pharisees approached Him
tempting Him and saying:
It is lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?[5]

[5]As the clause "for every cause" in Mt. xix, 3, is found in all the Greek Mss. and

As he knows, the wording of this captious question is oftentimes supposed to bespeak a direct reference to a controversy of St. Matthew's time between the disciples of Hillel and those of Shammai: while the former maintained the lawfulness of divorce for practically any cause,[6] the latter admitted it for the sole cause of the wife's unfaithfulness. In view of this reference, the question: "Is it lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?" would be an attempt on the part of Christ's adversaries to betray Him into a public "declaration in favor of *one* of the rival schools of the day (and that it would doubtless be that of Shammai; for with the clause 'for every cause' they suggested the answer, *No*), so that they might be able to stir up party feeling against Him."[7]

As the interpreter readily sees, this explanation of the question in Mt. xix, 3: "Is it lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?" goes against the well-ascertained intention of St. Matthew of presenting Our Lord's words as an answer in opposition to the mind of His adversaries: "But He answering said: Have you not read, etc." What our first Evangelist represents Jesus as denying is not the lawfulness of divorce *for every cause*, but the very lawfulness of divorce, since on the basis of two passages of the Law contrary to that lawfulness, he makes Him emphatically and unequivocally declare:

> What therefore God has joined together
> let not man put asunder.

It is plain, therefore, to the unbiassed examiner of Mt. xix, 4-6, that St. Matthew has worded the question of Christ's opponents, without a direct reference to the controversy between the disciples of Hillel and those of Shammai. He is thus led to examine more closely the wording of that question in Mt. xix, 3:

> And Pharisees approached Him
> tempting Him and saying:
> Is it lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?

and soon to ascertain the fact that, in the eyes of our first Synoptist the question: "Is it lawful to put away one's wife?" is simply the traditional equivalent of this question: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" St. Matthew knew, of course, that his Jewish

in all the Versions of St. Matthew's Gospel, and as it is our present object to ascertain the exact doctrine concerning divorce which this early document of Christianity ascribes here to Our Lord, it manifestly behooves us to treat that clause as genuine.

[6]Cfr. Talmud, treatise *Gittin*, chap. ix, 11; treatise *Sota*, chap. i, 1.

[7]H. A. W. Meyer, *on St. Matthew*, p. 337, (Engl. transl. Funk and Wagnalls. New York. 1884).

contemporaries looked upon the traditional interpretation of a passage of the Law, as setting forth its meaning so accurately that whoever would publicly go against such authoritative interpretation would make himself open to the charge of going against the written Law itself.[8] He was fully aware, too, that the traditional interpretation of the classical passage on divorce:

Deuter. xxiv.

1. When a man taketh a wife and marrieth her, and it cometh to pass, if she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found in her some indecency, that he writeth her a bill of divorce, and delivereth [it] into her hand, and putteth her out of his house,

2. and she departeth out of his house, and goeth and becometh another man's [wife],

3. and the latter man hateth her and writeth her a bill of divorce, and delivereth [it] into her hand, and putteth her out of his house; or if the latter man, who took her as his wife, die;

4. her former husband who put her away is not allowed to take her again to be his wife, after that she is defiled, for this is an abomination before Yahweh, and thou shalt not cause to sin the land which Yahweh, thy God, giveth thee [as] an inheritance.

was to the effect that Israel's lawgiver had sanctioned therein the practice of divorce for every cause,[9] which existed before his time and which he had simply regulated by requiring the giving of a bill of

[8]Cfr. A. Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ*, p. 287 sq. (Boston, Ira Bradley and Co. 1876). See also Mk. vii, 2-13; Mt. xii, 2-8.

[9]The following are the principal reasons for regarding this as the traditional interpretation of Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, among the Jews of St. Matthew's time: (1) the official expounders of this passage of the Law solemnly proclaimed in the synagogues of that day, as the *only thing required* by Moses from a man who wants to put away his wife, that he shall give her a bill of divorce (Cfr. the discussion of Mt. v, 31, in the foregoing article on *Divorce in the New Testament*); (2) such authorized Jewish expositors of the Mosaic Law as Philo (about 20 B. C.—50 A. D.) and Josephus (about 40–100 A. D.) in setting forth for their Gentile readers the contents of Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, manifestly record the traditional interpretation of that passage, and they use for that purpose expressions practically identical with the clause "for every cause," as we understand it, in Mt. xix, 3. The former, a prominent Alexandrian Jew, says: "If, proceeds the lawgiver, a woman having been divorced from her husband *under any pretence whatever*, and having married another, has again become a widow, whether her second husband is alive or dead, still she must not return to her former husband, but may be united to any man in the world rather than to him....." (*Of Special Laws, against Adultery*, etc.; chap. v, Engl. transl., by C. D. Yonge, vol. iii, p. 310 sq.) The latter, a celebrated Palestinian priest and *Pharisee*, writes: "He who desires to be divorced from his wife *for any cause whatever* (and many such causes happen among men, let him in writing give utterance that he will never use her as his wife any more...." (*Antiquities of the Jews*, Book IV, chap. viii, 23); (3) it is quite certain that in St. Matthew's time, both the Jewish teachers and their hearers, acting manifestly on the traditional interpretation of Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, practised divorce for any cause (Cfr. Josephus, *Life*, 75, 76; A. Edersheim, *the Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii, p. 332, note 5).

divorce from the man who was determined to put away his wife. And as he distinctly remembered in writing Mt. xix, 3-12, that in an earlier passage (Mt. v, 31-32), he had deliberately opposed what he knew to be Christ's own doctrine concerning divorce to the traditional interpretation of Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, so in this later passage (Mt. xix, 3-12), he consistently represented Our Lord's words against divorce in direct opposition to that traditional interpretation.[10] Under his pen, the question of "Pharisees" recorded by St. Mark (x, 2), in its more primitive form: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?"[11] assumed naturally its directly traditional, yet strictly equivalent, form: "Is it lawful to put away his wife for every cause?" It is in view of this too, that he represented here, as he did everywhere,[12] Our Lord's opposite words as a direct appeal from a traditional interpretation to the very text of the Law: "But He answering said: "*Have you not read that....*" And thus St. Matthew's actual frame of mind in wording the captious question which he had recorded in Mt. xix, 3:

> And Pharisees approached Him
> tempting Him and saying:
> Is it lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?

stands perfectly clear before the interpreter. "Pharisees," that is to say, staunch Jewish upholders of everything traditional, and constantly on the trail of Jesus for the purpose of charging Him with violations of the Law because He made light of their human traditions,[13] put to Him the question: "Is it lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?" in its distinct traditional form. They hoped thereby to betray Him into a public denial of this traditional interpretation of the lawfulness of divorce in Deuter. xxiv, 1, 4, and thus be able to treat before all present His negative answer as an open rejection of the very lawfulness of divorce granted by the great lawgiver of Israel.

---

[10]That in writing Mt. xix, 3-12, our first Synoptist had actually in mind his earlier representation of Christ's doctrine concerning divorce in Mt. v, 31-52, is proved by the fact that in both these passages he deliberately placed on Our Lord's lips characteristic expressions which show the manifest dependence of the later, on the earlier, passage:

Mt. v, 32.	Mt. xix, 9.
But I say to you that	But I say to you that
Everyone putting away his wife	Whoever shall put away his wife
except because of fornication...	unless for fornication...

[11]This primitive character of the question of the Pharisees in Mk. x, 2, was established in our opening article on *Divorce in the New Testament.*

[12]Cfr. Mt. xii, 2, 3; xii, 5; etc. Mk. vii, 9-13.

[13]Cfr. Mt. xv, 2-9; Mk. vii, 3, 5, 9, 13.

The foregoing is a careful and impartial examination of the text of Mt. xix, 3-6, to discover what manner of teaching concerning divorce is therein ascribed to Jesus. And this examination shows beyond doubt: (1) That taken in themselves, Our Lord's words in Mt. xix, 4-6, set forth His own explicit rejection of the lawfulness of divorce; and (2) that considered in their immediately preceding context, these same words of Christ were thus viewed by St. Matthew since he represented them as an answer in direct opposition to the lawfulness of divorce concerning which Jesus was asked by His adversaries.

III. Christ's Teachings in Mt. xix, 7-9. The next three verses of the passage of St. Matthew now under consideration form the second and concluding part of the discussion concerning divorce between Jesus and His adversaries. Even more expressly than the preceding verses, they profess to set forth Christ's teaching concerning divorce; and as is well known, they alone in Mt. xix, 3-12, contain that teaching with the exceptive clause: "unless for fornication." For these reasons, among others, they claim the greatest attention and care from the Biblical interpreter. The following is a strictly literal rendering of those verses from the original Greek:

Mt. xix.

7. They say to Him:
Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce
and to put away?
8. He says to them that
Moses for your hardness of heart
allowed you to put away your wives:
but from the beginning it was not so.
9. But I say to you that
Whoever shall put away his wife
unless for fornication
and shall marry another
commits adultery,
and he one put away marrying
commits adultery.

It is obvious to the interpreter of the first of these verses, that Our Lord's opponents find fault at once (notice the present tense: "*they say* to Him") with His answer which still rings in their ears. They are confident that He has actually committed Himself,—as they had hoped He would,—to a position which they can publicly represent as going against the text of the Law which they had in mind from the beginning. They therefore instantly exclaim:

Why then did Moses command to give her a bill of divorce
and to put away?

The passage of Moses distinctly referred to in this second question of Christ's adversaries, is of course no other than that of Israel's lawgiver in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, the full text of which reads as follows:

Deuter. xxiv.

1. When a man taketh a wife and marrieth her, and it cometh to pass, if she find no favor in his eyes, *because he hath found in her some indecency*, that he writeth her a bill of divorce, and delivereth [it] into her hand, and putteth her out of his house,

2. and she departeth out of his house, and goeth and becometh another man's [wife],

3. and the latter man hateth her and writeth her a bill of divorce, and delivereth [it] into her
hand, and putteth her out of his house; or if the latter man, who took her as his wife, die;

4. her former husband who put her away, is not allowed to take her again to be his wife, *after that she is defiled*, for this is an abomination before Yahweh, and thou shalt not cause to sin the land which
Yahweh, thy God, giveth thee [as] an inheritance.

This Deuteronomic decree was in St. Matthew's time the classica passage concerning the Jewish practice of divorce, and its contents are manifestly given in Mt. xix, 7, so as to bring forth the exact opposition which "Pharisees" contemplated between Our Lord's preceding answer and their own view of that Mosaic passage. Hence, the precise sense in which Christ's adversaries understood His doctrine concerning divorce, can be ascertained by a careful study of the manner in which they set forth the contents of Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, in direct opposition to His words.

On the basis of the Mosaic decree, two points appeared certain to them. The first is that in wording it as he did, Moses simply required for a lawful divorce, that a man should supply his wife with a bill of divorce before putting her away. According to them, Moses had indeed written at the beginning of his enactment, the clause "because he [the husband] hath found in her some indecency" ערות דבר, but plainly he had not treated it as expressing a necessary condition on the part of a man who wants to put away his wife, since soon afterwards (Deuter. xxiv, 3), speaking of the valid divorce of a second man who would have married to the dismissed wife, he had deliberately omitted that clause. Again, in their eyes, it did not affect in the least the lawfulness of divorce, that towards the end of the same decree (Deuter. xxiv, 4), Israel's lawgiver had qualified as an adulterous defilement ("after that she is defiled") the consummation of the wife's remarriage after divorce, since in the body of the decree, he had twice treated as valid the putting away of one's wife by means of a bill of divorce.

There remained therefore, according to their interpretation of the Deuteronomic text, but one requirement enjoined by Moses for the practice of divorce, viz: that a man should *give* his wife a bill of divorce before putting her away, the verb *to give* being in their eyes the exact equivalent of the Deuteronomic terms: "writeth her a bill of divorce and delivereth [it] into her hand," which are sedulously repeated in connection with each of the two cases of divorce contemplated by the framer of the decree. Whoever then, according to them, had complied with this sole requirement, had done all that Moses commanded to put away one's wife, and his action was altogether lawful.

From this their own understanding of the wording of the enactment in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, the Pharisaic opponents of Jesus' doctrine concerning divorce, had inferred a second point they which considered as no less certain than the one just explained. This second point bears on the purpose of Moses' "command to give a bill of divorce and to put away." The giving of such a document was prescribed, according to them, for the purpose of enabling a dismissed wife to remarry lawfully.

That these two points constituted in the eyes of the Pharisaic adversaries of Jesus the perfect admission of the lawfulness of divorce embodied by Moses in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, can be easily realized by any one who compares their questions concerning divorce recorded in Mt. xix, 3,-12 with the statements of Josephus (about 38-100 A. D.) relative to the same moral topic. Setting forth for his Gentile readers what he knew to be the traditional view of the Mosaic lawfulness of divorce in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, this celebrated Palestinian priest and Pharisee writes in his *Antiquities of the Jews* (Book IV, chap. viii, § 23:) "He who desires to be divorced from his wife for any cause whatever (and many such causes happen among men) let him in writing give assurance that he will never use her as his wife any more; for by this means she may be at liberty to live with another man, although before this bill be given she is not permitted to do so." The view which Flavius Josephus takes here of the contents of Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, is plainly identical with that of his fellow Pharisees when they put to Jesus the two questions related in Mt. xix, 3-12:

Mt. xix.

3. Is it lawful to put away one's wife for every cause?

Mt. xix.

7. Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce and to put away?

Both he and they are strict adherents of the traditional interpretation of Moses which regards the practice of divorce allowed for every cause. Both he and they feel quite sure that Moses sanctioned that practice by requiring no more than the giving of a bill of divorce with a view to allow the remarriage of a wife thus put away. Josephus' statements are direct and most explicit because he writes for pagan readers unacquainted with the precise formulas of the official expounders of the Law. Those of the Pharisaic opponents of Christ are more technical and present the form of captious questions in keeping with their present circumstances and with their secret desire of betraying Jesus into public disagreement with Moses. And it is the greater clearness of expression on the part of Josephus which enables the Biblical interpreter to realize the exact import of the second question of the Pharisaic opponents of Jesus in Mt. xix, 7. In asking Our Lord:

> Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce and to put away?

His adversaries set over against His preceding answer the two points contained, according to them, in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4:

(1) Moses' command to give a bill of divorce which they take to be the sole requirement of the Deuteronomic decree for a lawful divorce; and (2) Moses' purpose in prescribing this sole requirement, viz. that of allowing remarriage after divorce, which they assume to be his manifest purpose in commanding the giving of that bill to a dismissed wife. They think that these two points constitute the full admission of the lawfulness of divorce by Moses, and they oppose them both to Christ's foregoing answer, because they have understood it to be an absolute rejection of the lawfulness of divorce.

Such then is the exact meaning of the second question of "Pharisees" to Jesus in Mt. xix, 7, when closely examined in the light of the historical circumstances of St. Matthew's time. The unbiassed interpreter, who naturally feels bound to understand the text before him in that light, accepts this meaning as a further proof that Our Lord's foregoing answer cannot be taken otherwise than as an explicit rejection of the lawfulness of divorce. Nay more, he welcomes that meaning as affording him a clue to the fact that in the next two verses Our Lord is represented as returning two distinct answers,—each marked by its respective formula of introduction: "He says to them

that," "But I say to you that,"—to the apparently simple question of His opponents:

Mt. xix.
8. He says to them that
Moses for you hardness of heart
allowed you to put away your wives:
but from the beginning it was not so.
9. But I say to you that
Whoever shall put away his wife
unless for fornication
and shall marry another
commits adultery,
and he one put away marrying
commits adultery,

As by this question, "Pharisees" have brought against Jesus' total rejection of divorce, two really distinct charges corresponding to the two points which they consider to make up the full admission of divorce by Moses in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4, so in reply, He now gives two distinct answers, and thereby clears Himself of all opposition to the Deuteronomic decree. Christ's first answer, contained in Mt. xix, 8:

Mt. xix, 8.
He says to them that
Moses for your hardness of heart
allowed you to put away your wives:
but from the beginning it was not so,

deals with Moses' purpose in framing that decree, because this is the first point suggested by the form of the question of His adversaries:

Mt. xix, 7.
Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce
and to put away?

It is an answer the import of which is plain to any one who examines it in distinct view of the Mosaic enactment in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4. Jesus readily grants that Moses legislating in full view of the practice of divorce among the Jews of his time, did not abolish it, as was indeed clear from the fact that Israel's lawgiver had required a bill of divorce from the man who was determined to put away his wife. But He emphatically and most rightfully assigns to the Deuteronomic writer, a purpose altogether different from the one ascribed to him by His opponents. Of its very nature, the requiring of such a document was a curtailment of the husband's freedom in getting rid of an unwelcome wife. Besides, Moses had manifestly meant to make the giving of that bill particularly onerous on the dismissing

husband, in saying that such a one should *write* the bill of divorce, *deliver* it into the hand of his repudiated wife, and then only, put her away. Again, Moses' deterring purpose in framing his decree was shown by the fact that he warned expressly the man who was bent on sending away his wife, to bear in mind that once she is supplied with this written proof of her regular and absolute dismissal, the wife may henceforth refuse to go back to him, and indeed will not be free to return in the eventuality of a consummated union with another man. All this could be easily realized by Christ's adversaries, and all this proved Moses' precise frame of mind in enacting the decree in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4. Jewish tradition notwithstanding, Israel's lawgiver had not been prompted to require the giving of a bill of divorce to prove to all that the marriage tie had been actually severed and that a new marriage was therefore lawful; he had been actually led to legislate concerning divorce to discountenance its practice as far as this lay in his power. He was opposed to divorce, and he allowed its practice to the Jews "because of their hardness of heart." Had he seen his way to abolish it, he would have done so. But as he was well aware of the low moral temper of his people, he felt it beyond his power to root out a custom which, although inveterate among them, was contrary to what had existed at the beginning. The Mosaic permission of divorce was but a toleration of what the legislator had treated as a necessary evil, and Christ's opponents should not regard it as in any way meant by Moses to abrogate the primitive constitution of the union between husband and wife, and the explicit will of the Creator concerning it. Well therefore could Jesus reply to them:

Mt. xix, 8.

Moses for your hardness of heart
allowed you to put away your wives:
but from the beginning it was not so.
What therefore God has joined together
let no man put asunder,

and thus force upon them the conclusion that in considering divorce as wrong, far from running counter to, He exactly coincided with, the spirit which animated Moses in enacting his decree concerning divorce.

Whoever then examines impartially this first answer of Our Lord to His adversaries, readily sees what manner of teaching concerning divorce He is therein represented as vindicating against His opponents. That teaching is plainly no other than the absolute rejection

of the lawfulness of divorce to which His enemies had just objected as going against Moses' purpose in framing his decree in Deuter. xxiv, 1-4. In fact, Jesus feels so manifestly bound to maintain this position to which He had publicly committed Himself from the first in Mt. xix, 6:

> What therefore God has joined together
> let not man put asunder,

that to defend it He does not now hesitate to depart from the universally received and time honored view of "Pharisees" concerning the purpose of Israel's lawgiver in Deuter xxiv, 1-4, and to ascribe to Moses in that passage a frame of mind in manifest harmony with His own opposition to divorce.

Francis E. Gigot.

DE LIBRI ISAIAE INDOLE ET AUCTORE.

Propositis sequentibus dubiis Commissio Pontificia de re biblica sequenti modo respondit:

Dubium I.—Utrum doceri possit, vaticinia quæ leguntur in libro Isaiæ,—et passim in Scripturis,—non esse veri nominis vaticinia, sed vel narrationes post eventum confictas, vel, si ante eventum prænuntiatum quidpiam agnosci opus sit, id prophetam non ex supernaturali Dei futurorum præscii revelatione, sed ex his quæ jam contigerunt, felici quadam sagacitate et naturalis ingenii acumine, conjiciendo prænuntiasse?

Resp.—Negative.

Dubium II.—Utrum sententia quæ tenet, Isaiam ceterosque prophetas vaticinia non edidisse nisi de his quæ in continenti vel post non grande temporis spatium eventura erant, conciliari possit cum vaticiniis, imprimis messianicis et eschatologicis, ab eisdem prophetis de longinquo certo editis, necnon cum communi SS. Patrum sententia concorditer asserentium, prophetas ea quoque prædixisse, quæ post multa sæcula essent implenda?

Resp.—Negative.

Dubium III.—Utrum admitti possit, prophetas non modo tanquam correctores pravitatis humanæ divinique verbi in profectum audientium præcones, verum etiam tanquam prænuntios eventuum futurorum, constanter alloqui debuisse auditores non quidem futuros, sed præsentes et sibi æquales, ita ut ab ipsis plane intelligi potuerint; proindeque secundam partem libri Isaiæ (cap. xl-lxvi), in qua vates non Judæos Isaiæ æquales, at Judæos in exsilio babylonico lugentes veluti inter ipsos vivens alloquitur et solatur, non posse ipsum Isaiam jamdiu emortuum auctorem habere, sed oportere eam ignoto cuidam vati inter exsules viventi assignare?

Resp.—Negative.

Dubium IV.—Utrum ad impugnandam identitatem auctoris libri Isaiæ argumentum philologicum, ex lingua stiloque desumptum, tale sit censendum, ut virum gravem, criticæ artis et hebraicæ linguæ peritum, cogat in eodem pluralitatem auctorum agnoscere?

Resp.—Negative.

Dubium V.—Utrum solida prostent argumenta, etiam cumulative, sumpta, ad evincendum Isaiæ librum non ipsi soli Isiæ, sed duobus, imo pluribus auctoribus esse tribuendum?

Resp.—Negative.

Die autem 28 junii anni 1908, in Audientia ambobus Rmis Consultoribus ab Actis benigne concessa, Sanctissimus prædicta Responsa rata habuit ac publici juris fieri mandavit.

Romæ, die 29 junii 1908.

Fulcranus Vigouroux, P. S. S.
Laurentius Janssens, O. S. B.
Consultores ab Actis.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Life of Christ—by Mgr. E. Le Camus, translated by Rev. Wm. A. Hickey. Vol. iii. New York. The Cathedral Library Association. 1908. pp. xv-520.

On two several occasions we have already called the attention of the readers of the New York Review[1] to the English translation of the late Bishop Le Camus' *Vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ*. The present volume is the third and last instalment of this valuable publication, and it is marked by the same careful rendering on the part of the Rev. Translator, the same historical and critical insight on the part of the lamented Prelate, as we printed out in deference to the two preceding volumes. The first 160 pages of this third volume deal with the last days of Our Lord's public Ministry. In a vivid and accurate manner they describe Christ's going up to Jerusalem, His stay in Jericho and Bethany, His triumphal entrance into the Holy City on Palm Sunday, His words and deeds during the next three days, and close with an interesting chapter entitled: "The Final Result of Jesus' Ministry." The remainder of the volume forms *Part Third* of the whole work. Nearly all the questions, historical, critical, theological, etc., connected with the Last Supper are studied with a remarkable care in pp. 163-277. Then follows a detailed account of Our Lord's arrest, trial, crucifixion, death, and burial (pp. 278-411). The concluding chapters are taken up with a narrative of the resurrection, risen life, and ascension of the Son of God (pp. 412-501). Two valuable Indices to the three volumes, bring the whole work to an end.

The value of this last volume of Bishop Le Camus' Life of Christ can hardly be exaggerated. The events therein narrated are obviously of paramount importance in the eyes of all believers in Christ's divinity. They are the crowning marks of the love of the Savior of the world, the undoubted proofs of His divine mission and character, the perennial springs of spiritual life for regenerated humanity. They are facts which naturally demand to be handled with the utmost care and reverence, and whoever peruses the volume before us will readily see that such is precisely the method of treatment pursued by its learned author. At each step, the Rt. Rev. Prelate avails himself of every possible source of information to set forth with

[1] Cf. Nov.-Dec. 1906, p, 399 sqq.; Nov.-Dec., 1907, p. 366 sqq.

vividness and accuracy even the most minute details of the sacred narrative. He has too much respect for the Gospels, considered as historical documents, to think for a moment that their reliable character needs to be defended by winking at the difficulties suggested chiefly by a comparison of their parallel texts. In consequence, he frankly acknowledges all such difficulties, and with the honesty of a scholar who is not commited to any particular theory of Scriptural inspiration, he examines, modifies or even sets aside the various solutions, ancient or modern, which have been proposed in connection with them. He is indeed the "scribe instructed in the kingdom of heaven, [who] is like to a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure new things and old" (St. Matthew xiii, 52). He is closely accquainted both with ancient traditions and commentaries, and with the recent data of Palestine exploration, Biblical philology, textual and historical criticism, and turns everything to profit to draw a living picture of the last days of the God-Man, of His resurrection and ascension. It would therefore be difficult to imagine how he could have written a volume more interesting and instructive.

As the English translation was made from the sixth edition of the French original and thus embodies the mature results of Bishop Le Camus' study of the Gospels, it may not be amiss to point out some of the scientific positions set forth in the present volume. Of course, the Rt. Rev. author distinctly professes his thorough belief in the fact of the inspiration of the Evangelical records, but this does not present him from acknowledging the compilatory manner in which they were composed (pp. 126, 414), and from referring repeatedly to the "documents" on which they are based and the use of which accounts for the variations noticeable in their redaction (pp. 88, 195, etc.) According to him, "these variations...have no dogmatic importance, but here (Parable of the wicked husbandman), as in many other passages, they seem to render untenable those theories which exclude from our sacred books every inaccuracy no matter how slight, as if the inspiration of the sacred writers had the prerogative of extending infallibility into the most insignificant details. Undoubtedly on certain points in the present parable the agreement is not perfect among the Synoptics, nor can it be made so, whatever skill in harmonizing one may employ....It must be admitted, then, that, while all three are equally inspired, at least two of our Synoptics do not reproduce the exact words of the Master. This phenomenon is repeated, moreover, in other passages, doubtless of no great importance

but sufficiently numerous. It is with such passages, it seems to us, that theologians in investigating the true conditions of inspiration, ought to occupy themselves, before putting forth doctrines which the texts seem finally to render untenable" (p. 65. Cf. also pp. 15, 208, 418). Consistently with these views, Bishop Le Camus admits a considerable freedom of redaction and varying degrees of exactitude on the part of the Evangelists. "One would say," he writes p. 445 sq., "that as they approached the end of their work, our Evangelists, like the author of the *Acts*, gave less care to their production, and that the end comes about, leaving the story somewhat unfinished." He tells us in p. 45, that "the prophecy of Zacharias is quoted both by St. John and St. Matthew with a liberty that is content with following the sense, without seeking either the words or even the phraseology;" and in p. 156, that "St. John quotes from memory (a passage from Isaias) without care for verbal exactitude." In reference to St. Mark xii, 3, as compared with St. Matthew xxiv, 3, and St. Luke xxi, 7, he writes (p. 117): "Really, it is St. Mark who seems the most exact, and, as always, the most dramatic;" whereas in another connection (p. 193) he says: "Here it is St. Luke who seems the more exact." In p. 192, he informs us that "inversions must be made in St. Luke's text in order to adapt badly classed documents to the ever faultless succession of St. John;" and in p. 451, he speaks of St. Luke's "inaccurate perspective with reference to the Ascension." In connection with the events of the Last Supper, he says: "St. Mark xiv, 18-22, and St. Matthew xxvi, 21-26, clearly prove that once again, in the history of that night, the third Synoptic has not preserved the exact order of events;" and in connection with those of the Resurrection, he writes: "The truth is that St. Luke sets down in this place, as if by chance, a detail which he has found in the documents he is using, but in which all the other details are wanting. One feels that there is a certain indecision and vagueness in his account, and verse 12 (of St. Luke xxiv) comes from a source different from verse 11. Verse 24 likewise suggests something not related. He stands by that scrupulous fidelity which, here as elsewhere, makes it a duty for him to write down everything he knows, even if it should contradict that which precedes. But St. John quite appropriately explains that which seems to be inexplicable."

From among other noteworthy positions which Bishop Le Camus has adopted in the present volume, the following may be briefly mentioned. In his eyes, Christ's cursing of the fig-tree is a purely symboli-

cal act (p. 52 sqq.) The cleansing of the Temple recorded by the Synoptics he regards as distinct from the one described in St. John's Gospel (p. 56), while he identifies the sister of Martha and Lazarus, the Mary of the Fourth Gospel, with Mary Magdalen, "the woman who was a sinner" (p. 29). By means of a lengthy discussion, he shows to his own satisfaction that Jesus anticipated by one day the Paschal meal of the Jews, and that the four Evangelists agree in this regard (p. 173 sqq.) He strenuously maintains that Judas left the Paschal table before the institut on of the Holy Eucharist (p. 204), and thinks that Annas and Caiphas dwelt in one and the same place (p. 204). He devotes a long and valuable note to the proof that the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre has in its favor a historical ground which the topographical discoveries up to the present have failed to disprove (p. 397 sqq.) According to him, the last twelve verses of our second Gospel are "not from St. Mark's own pen" (p. 413), and the last chapter of St. John's Gospel is an appendix added to that Gospel at a very early date and yet to be referred to St. John with the exception, however, of its two concluding verses (p. 457 sq.). Finally Bishop Le Camus assigns, in a passing remark, St. Peter's martyrdom to 64 A. D.

By way of conclusion, we cannot do better than to quote the following endorsement of the whole work, from *The Month*, April, 1908, p. 433. This is "the very model of a book for study and reference. The Bishop has won the special commendation of the present Holy Father, in that he has managed to hold a middle course in his critical estimates between purblind conservatism and that reckless abandonment of sound positions that has brought disaster upon one school of Catholic exegesis. We cordially recommend this work for use in parish and school libraries, as well as in households of the faithful generally."

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Scholasticism Old and New: an Introduction to Scholastic Philosophy, Medieval and Modern—by M. DEWULF, D. Ph., Professor at Louvain; translated by P. COFFEY, D. Ph., Professor of Philosophy, Maynooth. Dublin, Gill and Son; New York, Benziger Bros. pp. 327.

All who are seriously interested in the attempt to make the neo-scholastic movement move have at times felt the need of some general

work on the system in the vernacular tongue which would lie somewhere between the amplitude of a Cursus Philosophicus and the succinctness of a history of philosophy. In these two latter classes of works we have fortunately been rather well supplied. The Stonyhurst Manuals—especially Father Maher's volume on Psychology, which is in a class by itself—have shown what the old philosophy has to say for itself when set face to face with the modern schools. In the domain of history of philosophy, Dr. William Turner has supplied us with an admirable account of the story of scholasticism in the past. But there was surely room for a work like the Introduction to Philosophy of, say, Paulsen—a work which would give a general idea of the principles, methods, and conclusions of the system in a way to attract the interest of the serious-minded public who lack the special training needed for the enjoyment of formal treatises and rigid demonstrations. That such is the purpose of this book M. DeWulf states in his Introduction: "The object of the present work is to meet and combat false conceptions, to co-ordinate true notions, and so to furnish the reader with some *general information* on the new scholasticism." In order to effect his purpose M. DeWulf finds it necessary to go back into a study of Medieval Scholasticism which occupies about half the book. One chapter of this section gives a brief but very clear resumé of the teachings of the great scholastics on the various problems in philosophy. Many a student who has spent two years over a text-book would gain a new insight into the system he has been studying if he were to read these 50 pages of well-knit presentation.

The author is on more debatable ground when he takes up a favorite topic of his—what precisely is scholastic philosophy? The phrase has been very loosely used, and admits of equivocation. It was to guard against this that the Encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* after commanding that "scholastic philosophy be made the basis of the sacred sciences," goes on to say: "And let it be clearly understood above all things that the scholastic philosophy We prescribe is that which the Angelic Doctor has bequeathed to us." This, however, is evidently offered by the Holy Father not as a definition but as a limitation of the term. Dr. DeWulf discusses the attempts to define scholasticism by its relation to a set of methods, or a period of time, or a dogmatic system, or the philosophy of Aristotle, or a theory about Universals. In none of these does he find the requisites for a complete definition. His own conclusions he has summarized

on p. 46: "There is a philosophical synthesis common to a group of the leading doctors of the West (Anselm of Canterbury, Alexander of Hales, Thomas of Aquin, Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, William of Occam). That synthesis does not sterilize thought in the case of any one of them. It is predominant in the Middle Ages; to it belongs the name of Scholastic Philosophy."

The second part of the work treats of "Modern Scholastic Philosophy." The chapter on "The Doctrines of the New Scholasticism" makes very interesting reading; it is, in fact, the main *raison d'etre* of the book. The author sketches briefly, at times too briefly, the present-day questions on which the neo-scholastic philosophy has, or should have, a word to say. Under the rubric "Cosmology" he devotes his entire space to the consideration of new problems in Physics in which his brilliant confrère, Professor Nys, has done such good work on the scholastic side. But he omits a problem which overshadows all the rest and which our neo-scholastics handle very gingerly—the question of Evolution.

The teacher of philosophy will be interested in the author's views on the methods for teaching and propagandism.

Dr. DeWulf, though an ardent and successful defender of ancient principles, is an equally ardent, and, we hope, an equally successful advocate of modern methods. He would not do away with the methods of stating and solving philosophical questions which are traditional in the schools, but he would supplement them by modern historical methods of approach, study of the natural sciences, laboratory and seminar work, etc. He gives considerable space to the much-debated question about the use of Latin in teaching the system. He insists, strongly, and properly, that at least for lay students the vernacular should be used in the class-room. The work of the Philosophical Institute at Louvain was almost wrecked ten years ago by an order to teach in Latin. M. DeWulf does not urge that the vernacular should be used in purely ecclesiastical institutions, but he does insist that even there the studies should not be confined to Latin, since before getting hold of philosophy in their native idiom few really understand it and fewer still can make any use of it.

The work has been translated into English by Dr. Coffey, who is Professor of Philosophy in the famous Irish center of ecclesiastical learning, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. It is sufficient praise to say that the translation is worthy of the work. And the reader will be especially grateful to him for an Appendix of more than fifty pages

in which he describes the School of Philosophy at Louvain, its men, methods, trials, successes. This was a task which M. DeWulf in his modesty could not undertake, though the matter forms a very proper and illuminating supplement to many of the suggestions that the Belgian writer had put forth.

One of the motives that led the distinguished young Irish professor to translate this work was "to prepare the way for translations or adaptations of the Louvain *Cours de philosophie.*" We hope that the eager reception of the present work will encourage him to go on along the lines he seems to have planned.

Francis P. Duffy.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Le Besoin et le Devoir Religieux, par MAURICE SEROL, Beauchesne, Paris.

THE ST. NICHOLAS SERIES. Edited by DOM BEDE CAMM, Benziger, N. Y.

Jeanne d' Arc, by C. M. ANTHONY.

St. Christopher, by CYRIL MARTINDALE, S. J.

Father Mathew, by KATHARINE TYNAN.

Blessed Thomas More, by a NUN OF TYBURN CONVENT.

The True Rationalism, by REV. M. POWER, S. J., Herder, St. Louis.

Harmonics, by REV. T. J. O'MAHONY, D. D., Gill, Dublin.

Priestly Vocation and Tonsure, by L. BACUEZ, S. S., Cathedral Library Assoc., New York.

Sturm und Steuer, by DR. K. HOLL, Herder.

Essays on the Apocalypse, by JAMES J. L. RATTON, Burnes and Oates, Benziger.

Vittorino da Feltre, by A SISTER OF NOTRE DAME, Benziger.

Meditationes, by DE PONTE, Herder.

Pentecost Preaching, by REV. A. DEVINE, Benziger.

First Book on Our Lady, by E. R. HULL, S. J., Herder.

Christ Among Men, by ABBE SERTILLANGES, Benziger.

The Dark Night of the Soul, by St. JOHN OF THE CROSS, Benziger.

Le Probleme de la Justification dans St. Paul, by E. JOBAC, Van Linthout, Louvain.

Manuel Bilique, N. T., by A. BRASSAC, Roger et Chernowitz.

Histoire des Livres du N. T., by E. JACQUIER, Lecoffire.

Introductio Generalis in S. S., CAROLUS TELCH, Pustet.

Tale of Tintern, by CASWALL. Burnes and Oates.

The Training of a Priest, by REV. J. T. SMITH, Longmans.

Meditations and Devotions, by CARDINAL NEWMAN, Longmans.

The Dream of Gerontius, by CARDINAL NEWMAN, Longmans.

What Is Life? by B. C. A. WINDLE, Herder.

Parerga, by CANON SHEEHAN, Longmans.

American Freemasonry, by Arthur Preuss, Herder.

GTU Library
3 2400 00335 3756

NOTICE

With this issue, which concludes Vol. III, THE NEW YORK REVIEW ceases publication.

At its inception three years ago its editors promised to present the best work of Catholic scholars at home and abroad on theological and other problems of the present day. It is the keeping of that promise, not the breaking of it, that is the cause of the suspension of the REVIEW. For the number of Catholics interested in questions which are of importance to the thinkers of the present generation—and which will be vital to all classes in the next—has been found to be so small that it does not justify the continuance of the REVIEW. It would be possible perhaps to treat the same topics in a more popular style, but the editors are strongly of opinion that new and difficult problems should be discussed in a way that will attract the attention of only trained and scholarly minds. Or the scope of the REVIEW might be changed, but this would bring it into needless competition with other Catholic periodicals which are doing excellent work in their chosen departments.

A newspaper report which has obtained wide circulation renders it necessary in justice to our ecclesiastical superiors and to ourselves to make a further statement. Neither THE NEW YORK REVIEW nor any issue of it, nor any article published in it has ever been made the object of official condemnation or censure by any authority, local or general, in the Catholic Church. It is now suspending publication, not by command of authority, but by the decision of its editors and for the reasons set down.

It only remains to return sincere thanks to the subscribers who have given their loyal support to the enterprise; and especially to the contributors, who have given of their best so generously with little or no recompense save the consciousness of doing their duty in the cause of religion and learning.